

VIRGIL *and* JOYCE

Nationalism and Imperialism in the *Aeneid* and *Ulysses*



RANDALL J. POGORZELSKI

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

Virgil and Joyce

Publication of this volume has been made possible, in part,
through the generous support and enduring vision of
Warren G. Moon.

VIRGIL *and* JOYCE

Nationalism and Imperialism
in the *Aeneid* and *Ulysses*

RANDALL J. POGORZELSKI

The University of Wisconsin Press

The University of Wisconsin Press
1930 Monroe Street, 3rd Floor
Madison, Wisconsin 53711-2059
uwpress.wisc.edu

3 Henrietta Street, Covent Garden
London WC2E 8LU, United Kingdom
eurospanbookstore.com

Copyright © 2016

The Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System

All rights reserved. Except in the case of brief quotations embedded in critical articles and reviews, no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, transmitted in any format or by any means—digital, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise—or conveyed via the Internet or a website without written permission of the University of Wisconsin Press. Rights inquiries should be directed to rights@uwpress.wisc.edu.

Printed in the United States of America

This book may be available in a digital edition

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Pogorzelski, Randall J., author.

Title: Virgil and Joyce: nationalism and imperialism in the Aeneid and Ulysses /
Randall J. Pogorzelski.

Other titles: Wisconsin studies in classics.

Description: Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, [2016] |
©2016 | Series: Wisconsin studies in classics | Includes bibliographical
references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2015036815 | ISBN 9780299308001 (cloth: alk. paper)

Subjects: LCSH: Virgil. Aeneis—Criticism, Textual. | Joyce, James, 1882–1941.
Ulysses—Criticism, Textual. | Joyce, James, 1882–1941. Ulysses—Sources. |
Nationalism in literature.

Classification: LCC PA6825 .P548 2016 | DDC 873/.01—dc23

LC record available at <http://lcn.loc.gov/2015036815>

For my parents

Contents

	<i>Acknowledgments</i>	IX
	Introduction	3
1	Joyce's "Aeolus" and the Semicolonial Virgil	24
2	Joyce's Citizen and Virgil's Cacus	41
3	The Virgilian Past of Nationalism	68
4	Joyce's Rudy and Virgil's Marcellus	91
5	Virgil's Joycean Poetics	111
	Conclusion	137
	<i>Notes</i>	143
	<i>Bibliography</i>	157
	<i>Index</i>	169
	<i>Index Locorum</i>	175

Acknowledgments

First books can take a while, and this one began a little over a decade ago. I owe a debt of gratitude above all to Sara Lindheim, who was supportive, critical, and generous at every stage of the process. I also owe thanks to my colleagues in the University of California, Santa Barbara departments of classics, English, and comparative literature, including especially Maurizia Boscagli, Enda Duffy, and Francis Dunn. Since my time at UC Santa Barbara, I have worked at Scripps College in Claremont, California; the University of California, Irvine; the University of New England, Australia; and the University of Western Ontario. I am grateful to my colleagues for their help and encouragement and to the institutions themselves for various forms of research support. I have presented small parts of this project at meetings of the American Philological Association (when it still had that name), the Classical Association of Canada, the Australasian Society for Classical Studies, the Modern Language Association, the Pacific Ancient and Modern Language Association, and the American Comparative Literature Association. I have also presented material from this book in colloquia and research groups at UC Santa Barbara, UC Irvine, Texas Tech University, the University of New England, the University of Western Ontario, and Illinois Wesleyan University. I am grateful to the audiences of my presentations for helpful suggestions and productive discussions. I have published a version of chapter 3 of this book as “The ‘Reassurance of Fratricide’ in the *Aeneid*,” *American Journal of Philology* 130.2 (2009): 261–289. It is reprinted here with the kind permission of the Johns Hopkins University Press. I have also published a version of chapter 4 as “Ghosts of Optimism: Virgil’s Parade of Heroes in Joyce’s ‘Circe,’” *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 16.3/4 (2009): 443–466. It is reprinted here with the kind permission of Springer SBM. I owe thanks to the editors of those journals, David Larmour and Wolfgang Haase, respectively, and to the anonymous readers of the articles. I thank the following people who have read and commented on drafts of various parts of this book: Catherine Burke, Jonas Grethlein, Alexander Meyer, James Porter, Willis Scilacci, and Aara Suksi. I should single out Bronwyn Hopwood, who read the entire manuscript more than once and has had a great influence on its final shape. I am grateful

Acknowledgments

to the University of Wisconsin Press, including especially Patricia Rosenmeyer, Raphael Kadushin, Adam Mehring, Judith Robey, and Amber Rose, and to the anonymous readers of the manuscript. While all of the people named here have made this book a better one, of course the faults are my own.

Virgil and Joyce

Introduction

James Joyce wrote *Ulysses* between 1914 and 1921, publishing it serially beginning in March 1918 and in its entirety on February 2, 1922. These were transformative years for Europe and for Ireland, with World War I lasting from 1914 to 1918 and the Irish War of Independence from 1918 to 1921. Virgil wrote the *Aeneid* between 29 and 19 BCE, in the years immediately following the civil wars of the first century BCE, when the Augustan regime began to establish what we now call the Roman Empire. Virgil and Joyce both wrote during times of significant and violent political change, and their works helped to shape new collective identities for Rome and for Ireland. It should not be surprising, then, that although *Ulysses* explicitly declares itself to be Homeric, it also makes extensive use of the *Aeneid*, especially in the episodes that deal with the Irish nationalist war against the British Empire. It is perhaps more surprising that, although in other contexts the *Aeneid* is an epic of empire, British as well as Roman, *Ulysses* finds in the *Aeneid* a partner in the contradictions and hesitations of forming a collective identity following the breakdown of empire.

The majority of scholarly work on Joyce's use of Latin literature in general and Virgil in particular identifies and catalogues classical allusions in Joyce's work, aiming to help Joyce's readers to decode obscured levels of meaning and to understand Joyce's thought (Senn 1989a; Senn 1989b; Schork 1997; Arkins 1999). This book, in contrast, investigates the engagement of *Ulysses* with the *Aeneid* as a bi-directional process, demonstrating not only how *Ulysses* uses the *Aeneid* to construct an emerging Irish national identity but also how Joyce's reception of Virgil constructs or even produces the *Aeneid* as a narrative that cobbles together a collective identity from the fragments left by the civil wars of the first century BCE. Rather than using the *Aeneid* as a cipher to decode secret meanings in *Ulysses*, I argue that *Ulysses* brings Virgil's epic into its own postcolonial world as a poem that negotiates the fragmentary political identities of empire and resistance. Readers of this book may be surprised to find that, while it has much to say about *Ulysses*, it has more to say about the *Aeneid*. Joyce's nationalist reception of Virgil encourages a reading of

the *Aeneid* not as a celebration or criticism of the greatness of Rome and Augustus, but as an effort to construct ancient roots for a new collective identity in the wake of terrible crisis.

Like many aspects of modern life, nations and nationalism are now so deeply rooted as to seem natural and universal. Benedict Anderson's *Imagined Communities*, first published in 1983, is still the starting point for studying nationalism. Anderson points out that in the modern world everyone has a nation, just as everyone has a gender (Anderson 2006, 5). He also argues, however, that nationalism is an invention of the late eighteenth century.¹ It is difficult for us to imagine people for whom political identity is not national. Nevertheless, nationalism is not natural or inevitable, but a modern cultural construction of extraordinary power despite its internal contradictions. Anderson identifies three key contradictions in nationalism. First, nations are modern inventions but seem to nationalists to have ancient roots. Second, nations and nationalism are now universal, but each nation is unique. Third, nationalism has great political power, but it has a "philosophical poverty and even incoherence" (Anderson 2006, 5). For Anderson, nationalism is properly a cultural formation rather than a political one, and it should be analyzed anthropologically (as in the case of kinship and religion) rather than politically (as in the case of liberalism or fascism). Its roots are to be found not in political philosophy, but in the cultural conditions of Europe and European colonies in the eighteenth century, when the Enlightenment was "destroying the legitimacy of the divinely-ordained, hierarchical dynastic realm" (Anderson 2006, 5). The recent rise of nationalism makes it all the more shocking that it inspires so many people to kill and die for "the shrunken imaginings of recent history" (Anderson 2006, 7).

By focusing on the rupture between nationalism and the hierarchical dynastic realm that preceded it in Europe, Anderson asserts the modernity of nationalism by contrasting it with its immediate predecessor, but he does not analyze it in relation to earlier political formations or cultural communities. The birth of modern nationalism, however (especially if Anderson is right to see it in the American and French revolutions), involved an incorporation of what nationalists thought of as classical Greek and Roman ideas.² Although this book is specifically about Virgil and Joyce, it has broad implications for the role of classical reception in the formation of modern national cultures. Joyce's incorporation of Virgil into his novel of the new Irish nation is an act of classical reception in the construction of a modern national culture. Such a reception is important not only for scholars interested in Irish nationalism, but also for those interested in the cultural roots of Augustan Roman collective identity. For a reader attuned to the characteristics of modern nationalism, the *Aeneid* opens itself to an analysis of the aspects of Virgil's ancient epic that attract Joyce's nationalist reception.

Modern Nationalism and Ancient Roman Political Identity

Joyce's use of the *Aeneid* in a novel of the Irish nation raises the question of how applicable theories of modern nationalism are to Virgil's epic of Italy. Classical scholars have recently found Anderson's work on nationalism particularly useful for analyses of the *Aeneid*. Katherine Toll (1997), Yasmin Syed (2005), J. D. Reed (2007), and K. F. B. Fletcher (2014), for example, have effectively demonstrated the importance of nationalism as a concept in the *Aeneid*.³ However, these scholars are hesitant to be specific in their application of Anderson's ideas to the *Aeneid* because the latter is an ancient text, and Anderson (like most theorists of nations and nationalism) asserts that the nation is a modern invention.⁴ Nevertheless, as Toll, Syed, Reed, and Fletcher demonstrate, Anderson's exclusive focus on modern nation-states does not mean that the model of collective, political identities he develops is not useful for reading ancient texts. While ancient and modern collective identities differ sharply, Anderson's ideas are sufficiently broad as to be productive for ancient texts as well as modern. In light of the recent scholarship that makes use of nationalism to read the *Aeneid*, it has become important to investigate in some detail how and why Anderson's theory of modern nationalism is applicable to Virgil's ancient text.

There are two main arguments for the modernity of nationalism. The first is that particular nations are recently invented and have not continually existed since antiquity. Ireland, for example, is not an ancient nation, but one invented by English colonization and the nationalist independence. The second argument is that nations and nationalism in general are inventions of the late eighteenth century. The first argument poses no problem for a discussion of nationalism in Virgil. I do not dispute that individual nations are discontinuous, and that modern nationalism is quite distinct from ancient Roman political identity. Modern Italy, for example, is not the same state as Augustan Rome. Individual modern governments and the global spread of nationalism are historically contingent phenomena, and it is important to stress their modernity against tendentious, nationalist claims of antiquity.

The second argument for the modernity of nationalism, namely that nations and nationalism in general are modern inventions, poses more problems for an analysis of an ancient epic using theories of nationalism. Nevertheless, the fact that modern nationalism has unique features does not mean that ancient states are not in some ways like nations. Moreover, the usage of classical models in the construction of modern nations, as Joyce uses Virgil, means that modern nationalisms contain elements of ancient constructions of political identity. Augustan Rome in particular shares certain important characteristics with modern nations. Anderson's

initial, broad definition identifies three basic criteria for nationhood, and Augustan Rome meets all three. According to Anderson, “[A nation] is an imagined political community—and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign” (Anderson 2006, 6). First, Augustan Rome is an imagined community. As Anderson notes, “In fact, all communities larger than primordial villages of face-to-face contact (and perhaps even these) are imagined” (Anderson 2006, 6). Romans imagined a shared cultural identity with other Romans including those they had never met. Being Roman is an important part of the way Romans imagine their identity.

Augustan Rome is also a sovereign state.⁵ This may seem obvious, but it is an important characteristic of nations. Nationalism is not simply a cultural identification, but an ideology that aims at political independence. Individuals combine many group identities. One may identify by gender, sexuality, race, ethnicity, religion, or any number of other categories. What makes nationalist identification unique is that nationality includes political sovereignty. Even when nations are subject to foreign rule, nationalist movements always aim at national political independence. Romans identify themselves as such not merely by a shared language and personality, but by a collective political sovereignty. A Roman citizen is politically subject to Rome and to no other political entity.

Anderson’s final criterion, that the nation by definition is imagined as limited, is a more complex issue for Virgil’s Rome. It is important for nations to define their unique identity against an external other, and so a state is not a nation if it dreams of incorporating all humanity. Virgil, however, has Jupiter promise to Rome “*imperium sine fine*” (“empire without end”; *Aeneid* 1.279).⁶ Universal, or at least ecumenical, empire is central to Augustan ideology. Augustus begins the *Res Gestae*, “*Rerum gestarum divi Augusti, quibus orbem terrarum imperio populi Romani subiecit*” (“The deeds of divine Augustus, by which he subjected the world to the rule of the Roman people”). Nations, for Anderson, are inherently limited, while Augustus and Virgil stress the limitless nature of the Roman Empire. The reason that the official assertion of universal empire does not contradict the limited character of the nation is that the relationship of Rome to the world is one of domination. When Anderson writes that “no nation imagines itself as coterminous with mankind” (Anderson 2006, 7), he does not mean that no nation aspires to global domination. In fact, global empire is a common aspiration of imperialist nationalism. One need only think of the vast empires of nineteenth-century European nations. The nation is limited in that its people are citizens only within defined territorial borders; outside of those borders the people are subjects. The Roman claims of empire do not extend the rights of citizenship to the entire world, but instead subjugate the entire world to Rome. In this sense, the borders of the Roman state are not identical with those of the Roman empire, but end at the territorial

limit of Roman citizenship. For Virgil, the Roman state is Italy. It is within the borders of Italy that Rome exists as a limited, territorial state.

The decisive development that makes Anderson's definition and theory of nationalism useful for analysis of Virgil's *Aeneid* is Rome's change from an imperial city-state into a territorial state. Rome began as one city-state among others in Italy. The transformation of Italy from a collection of independent cities with varying and competing ranges of influence into a unified and bounded community was a gradual process, but one that culminated at the time Virgil was writing the *Aeneid* (Toll 1997, 35, 38–39). After Actium, for the first time there existed a peaceful, unified Italy. Actium is the moment Jean-Michel David identifies as the one at which the “political and ideological unification of Italy was completed” (David 1996, 174–175). Italy had long been Romanized, but Actium was the turning point in the Italianization of Rome. While in reality the integrity of Augustan Roman borders was not perfect, since there existed citizens outside of Italy and non-citizens inside of Italy, ideologically the Augustan Roman state was territorially defined. The presentation of the battle as a clash between the Italian armies of Octavian and the Eastern armies of Antony and Cleopatra meant that a victory for Octavian's Rome was a victory for the ideology of unified Italy. Culturally and ideologically, Octavian's great triumph lay in successfully redefining Romanness as a geographical association with Italy. The new definition of Roman as Italian is why it is so important in Augustan culture, including the *Aeneid*, to insist that Actium was a foreign war (Quint 1993, 21–31; Galinsky 1996, 74–76). Actium was the moment in which the ideology of Rome as a territorial Italian state prevailed.

Augustan reforms went a long way toward an administrative enactment of the ideological Italianization of Rome. When Augustus set about establishing the postwar government of the empire he was faced with the task of organizing a citizen body of unprecedented size and geographical distribution. Two especially important innovations are of interest here. First, Augustus divided Italy into eleven administrative regions, each with fixed geographical borders (Nicolet 1991, 173–176). The regions organized the administration of Roman citizens according to geography. The division established a bounded territory that determined political status. Second, Augustus, perhaps concerned that the practice of gathering in Rome to vote disenfranchised most Italians, organized a system by which some regional votes could be counted in Rome (Nicolet 1991, 198–202). The system of regional voting allowed the citizens who had gained the vote in stages starting with the outbreak of the Social War in 90 BCE to participate in the government. In effect, the new administrative practice, rather than the legal grants of citizenship, distributed the right of political participation throughout the Italian peninsula. The two reforms—determining political status by means of geographical

boundaries and enacting that political status in regional voting—completed the historical transformation of Rome from a city ruling an empire into the capital city of a territorial Italian state.

To be sure, even after the Augustan reforms the political and administrative reality of the Roman state did not perfectly enact the ideological ideal of a bounded, territorial, whole Italy. Moreover, even on the level of ideology the development of Rome into a territorial state did not make it identical to a modern nation-state. Nevertheless, theories and literary representations of nationalism and nation-states since the eighteenth century are useful for a study of Augustan culture. Rome shares essential, ideological characteristics with modern nations. It is a sovereign state based on an imagined community defined by a bounded, territorial space. It is also a patchwork of identities and ideologies resisting unification and requiring a rewriting of the past.

The Literary Form of Nationalism

An additional difficulty with the use of theories of nationalism to analyze Virgil's ancient epic is that the characteristic literary form of nationalism is not the epic, but the novel. Anderson begins his analysis of nationalism with a study of its "cultural roots" (Anderson 2006, 9–36). For Anderson, the rise of nationalism is connected with print capitalism and the literary form of the novel, as well as a particular kind of historical consciousness that did not exist in antiquity (Anderson 2006, 23–39). Nationalism connects the people of a nation across the space of the nation simultaneously, and it produces and measures that simultaneity by clock and calendar. For this, Anderson relies on Walter Benjamin's association of modern historicism with "homogeneous, empty time," or the notion of time as a neutral medium that is measurable by seconds and years rather than an experiential notion of time "filled by the presence of the now [*Jetztzeit*]" (Benjamin 1968, 261). The advent of the newspaper made it possible to convey information to a large, widely distributed audience with a new degree of simultaneity, marked by the calendric date. Citizens of a nation bond by sharing stories of where they were when a particularly important national event occurred; they rely on a notion of simultaneity that was hardly imaginable in antiquity.⁷ Even in smaller ways, the time-coded information of news reports allows modern citizens in their daily lives to unite with others through simultaneously shared information. Dipesh Chakrabarty connects the nationalism of India with the sudden imposition of clock-time and salary work (Chakrabarty 2000, 215). The imposition of the clock and calendar on the colonial space produces a particular perception of time in daily life, and it also puts the colony in its proper place in history. From there it is only a matter of time

until historical progress appears inevitable and a modern nation develops. From the clock-measured minutes of daily life to the calendar-measured history of the nation, modern nationalism depends on a kind of historicist consciousness that places the people within Benjamin's homogeneous, empty time.

For Benjamin, Anderson, and Chakrabarty, the literary form of homogeneous, empty time is the novel.⁸ *Ulysses*, for example, takes place specifically on June 16, 1904, and each event takes place at an identifiable time of the day. The narrative form of the realist novel in particular relies on an assumption of measurable simultaneity. It is always possible to think of a "meanwhile," which enables "transverse, cross-time, marked not by prefiguring and fulfillment but by temporal coincidence, and measured by clock and calendar" (Anderson 2006, 24; quoted in Bhabha 1994, 226). The novel, with its characteristic temporality, emerges in opposition to other literary forms with different ideas of time. For Benjamin, the form opposed to the novel is the story, which he further connects with epic. The novel, Benjamin argues in "The Storyteller," conveys information (Benjamin 1968, 87–90). Information, which is the content of the newspaper as well as the novel, is related to the immediate surroundings of the reader. It is subject to immediate verification:

The value of information does not survive the moment in which it was new. It lives only at that moment; it has to surrender to it completely and explain itself without losing any time. A story is different. It does not expend itself. It preserves and concentrates its strength and is capable of releasing it even after a long time. (Benjamin 1968, 90)

This does not mean that a novel is only readable at the moment of its composition, but rather that the novel is historically connected to the present. The novel may be set in the past, but it is always a past that is located by the calendar in a continuous narrative of progress toward the present moment.⁹ The story, on the other hand, depends on distance. Benjamin writes of the content of the story, "The intelligence that came from afar—whether the spatial kind from foreign countries or the temporal kind of tradition—possessed authority which gave it validity, even when it was not subject to verification" (Benjamin 1968, 89). This distance between the subject of the story and its composition means that the story does not simply explain, but communicates experience dialectically.¹⁰ In the form of epic, as Anderson notes, the temporal manifestation of that distance is the absolute past, connected to the present not in a continuous chain of events, but by a dialectical relation of prophecy and its fulfillment.¹¹

Chakrabarty, in his association of nationalism with the novel, makes a similar distinction but focuses on the opposition between prose and poetry. He argues

that for colonial India, prose was the medium of the news, and poetry was the medium of something other than information (Chakrabarty 2000, 168). While relying on Anderson and Benjamin, Chakrabarty argues, “The function of the poetic was to create a caesura in historical time and to transport us to a realm that transcended the historical” (Chakrabarty 2000, 166). For Benjamin, Anderson, and Chakrabarty, the difference between the poetic epic and the prosaic novel is that the novel sits in the homogeneous, continuous, empty time of historicism, while the epic draws its authority from the absolute past in discontinuous time.

The association of the novel with nationalism is compelling, and it is undeniable that there is an important literary element in the cultural roots of nationalism. It is, however, too easy and too schematic to associate the novel with a modern, historicist kind of temporality and the epic with an ancient, dialectical kind of temporality. Homi Bhabha challenges the causal linkage of modern literary form and modern politics by arguing that there is more than one kind of temporality involved in nationalism. On the one hand, there is the linear, causal chain of history that takes place in homogeneous, empty time, producing the nation by constructing a traditional past. This Bhabha calls the “pedagogical” aspect of nationalism. There is also, however, a “performative” aspect of nationalism, which produces the nation in the present moment by collective action and collective characteristics (Bhabha 1994, 209–219). The division of the performative and pedagogical aspects of nationalism, each with its associated temporalities, can never be resolved and, for Bhabha, constitutes a serious complication for Anderson’s temporality of nationalism (Bhabha 1994, 227–232). What is important for the present argument in Bhabha’s production of the nation in the splitting of the pedagogical and the performative is that there is not a single temporality of nation and narration, linking the novel and the nation as partners in modernity. Bhabha’s analysis starts to break down the rigid boundaries between, on the one hand, the novel, the nation, and modernity, and on the other hand, the epic, the empire, and antiquity.

The temporality of the modern nation is not simple or unitary, and neither is the temporality of the ancient epic. Benjamin’s opposition between the novel and the story or the epic, along with Anderson’s and Chakrabarty’s association of the novel with the nation, relies for the most part on Homeric epic. The Homeric epics relate to a legendary past that cannot be pinpointed on a calendar or connected in a continuous chain of events to the present, but even ancient reception of the Homeric epics makes various attempts to do so. Thucydides, for example, places the Trojan War within historical time. For Virgil, Homeric temporality joins with the Roman tradition of historical epic and with the Caesarian and Augustan reorganization of the calendar and of history (Feeney 2007). While Virgilian time does link the past and present through prophecy, it also includes history in the

form of Aeneas's visit to Elysium and the events depicted on his shield. Moreover, Jupiter's book 1 prophecy (*Aeneid* 1.254–296) makes an effort to place the arrival of Aeneas in Italy within a continuous historical time by numbering the years between Aeneas's landing and the rise of Rome's first king, Romulus. The *Aeneid* participates in a project of constructing a past that is continuously connected to the historical time of the present. Before print capitalism, Virgil does not measure workdays and salaries, nor do newspapers generate a simultaneous dissemination of information as a cultural foundation for an Augustan nation. The discontinuous time of prophecy and fulfillment is an important part of the relation between past and present in the *Aeneid*. Nevertheless, the temporality of the *Aeneid* is not absolutely foreign to the temporality of nationalism. The form of the *Aeneid* is not modern, and I do not wish to ignore the differences between the ancient epic and the modern novel. It is too easy, however, to insist on strict and exclusive definitions of ancient and modern, and of epic and novel. For all that ancient and modern literary forms and political identities differ, it is also important to analyze their similarities.

Irish Nationalism and Joyce's Fiction

While the use of nationalism as an approach to reading *Ulysses* is less problematic than its use as an approach to reading the *Aeneid*, nevertheless the representation of Irish nationalism in Joyce's fiction is a contentious issue in scholarship. In all of his fiction, Joyce maintains a complex and deeply ambivalent relation to Ireland and Irish politics. When, for example, at the end of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, Stephen Dedalus leaves Ireland to, as he puts it, “forge in the smithy of my soul the uncreated conscience of my race,” he turns his back on Ireland in order to create it abroad.¹² It is a strange move to create the conscience of a race by leaving it behind. It displays a deep frustration with Ireland, and at the same time a deep commitment to it. Such ambivalence frames the scholarly debate concerning the politics of Joyce's fiction, which asks to what extent Joyce's fiction reflects Stephen's (and Joyce's own) rejection of Ireland in favor of continental Europe, and to what extent it displays a commitment to the land of his birth. Basic features of *Ulysses* point in both directions. On the one hand the action takes place in Dublin, while on the other hand Joyce bases his novel on Homer's classical European epic. My contention is that in *Ulysses*, Joyce constructs a cultural history of Ireland through the European classical tradition. While current scholarship focuses either on the Irish nationalist aspects of *Ulysses* or its intertextuality with classical literature, treating the two as clearly distinct issues, my reading of the intertextuality between the *Aeneid* and *Ulysses* shows that the novel's relation to Irish nationalism is rooted in classical literature. By engaging intertextually

with the classical European tradition, *Ulysses* constructs Irish nationalism as an intercultural relation.

Early responses to Joyce's fiction showed considerable interest in the politics of his work. Joyce's most influential contemporary critic and admirer, Ezra Pound, praised Joyce's fiction as cosmopolitan and international, rejecting the backward provincialism of Ireland (Pound 1967; 1970). Contemporary reviews of *Ulysses*, on the other hand, often focused on the "coarseness" and "squalor" of the novel as specifically Irish and anti-English (Deming 1970, i.195–239). This early critical interest in the politics of *Ulysses*, however, was soon replaced by scholarly interest in the novel's allusivity and intertextuality. Stuart Gilbert's 1930 book, *James Joyce's Ulysses*, published for the first time Joyce's "schema" detailing, among other structural tools, the basic correspondences between *Ulysses* and Homer's *Odyssey*. The schema (and especially the information on the Odyssean parallel) provided a useful starting point for scholarly work on *Ulysses* as well as a lifeline for confused readers and substitute for the novel itself for those unable to obtain a copy (Attridge 2004, 9–10).

The next fifty years of *Ulysses* scholarship produced many insightful readings of the text, but showed little interest in the novel's relation to Irish politics. Led by such scholars as Harry Levin, Hugh Kenner, and Richard Ellmann, the field treated *Ulysses* as a brilliant example of European Modernism, transcending issues of nationalism and colonialism (Kenner 1955; Ellmann 1959; Levin 1960; Ellmann 1972; Kenner 1987). Where the scholarship of this period does discuss nationalism in Joyce's fiction, it argues that the texts reject nationalism in favor of pacifism and cosmopolitanism. Ellmann, for example, reads Stephen's departure from Ireland as an expression of Joyce's own rejection of the nation and even "resentment at the possibility of Irish independence" (Ellmann 1959, 113). Kenner's influential reading of the "Cyclops" episode argues that its political meaning is a straightforward critique of the Gaelic Revival and Irish nationalism (Kenner 1955, 254–255). In contrast to the citizen's nationalism, Ellmann argues, Bloom's internationalism is "an ethical view which is superior" (Ellmann 1972, 114). From the beginnings of Joyce scholarship in the 1930s all the way through the 1970s, when scholars engaged with the politics of Joyce's fiction, they read it as a reflection of the author's rejection of Ireland.

The 1980s saw a renewed interest in the politics of Joyce's fiction, and a new respect for the complexity of the relation between Joyce's fiction and Irish nationalism. At the beginning of the decade, scholars like Colin MacCabe (1979) and Dominic Manganiello (1980) began a new movement that emphasized the deep ambivalence of the politics of Joyce's fiction and recognized its sincere Irish nationalism. In the 1990s a group of scholars, including especially Enda Duffy (1994),

Vincent Cheng (1995), and Emer Nolan (1995), read *Ulysses* as a novel of the Irish independence. Irish colonial and postcolonial readings of the novel have now become dominant in the field. The prevailing opinion holds that Joyce's fiction is not only intensely political but also contains a great deal of nationalist sentiment.

The nationalist readings of *Ulysses* dominant in the last two or three decades focus on the relation of Joyce's fiction to the emergence of the Irish nation. This scholarship emphasizes what is modern in the texts. Nolan says of Bloom and his nationalist rival "the citizen" that "They are both essentially modern" (Nolan 2000, 92), and Derek Attridge and Marjorie Howes explain, "While nationalism may selectively invent and appeal to traditional values, practices and culture, all the major theorists of the nation agree that it is a thoroughly modern phenomenon" (Attridge and Howes 2000, 11). The analyses of modernity and nationhood in Joyce tend to exclude Joyce's classical allusions, both because of their antiquity and because they relate to Joyce's involvement in a transnational, European tradition.¹³ There is, therefore, an artificial divide in criticism of *Ulysses* between Irish modernism and the classical European tradition. What is at stake, however, in Joyce's use of the classical European tradition is precisely the future of the Irish nation.

Reception and Intertextuality

A reading of the relationship between the *Aeneid* and *Ulysses* engages with allusion, intertextuality, and reception studies. These terms and the scholarly approaches they represent are important in this book, and some preliminary remarks and definitions will be useful. While allusion, intertextuality, and reception are related, they are not synonymous, and each will take more and less prominent positions at different points in my argument. Some parts of this book depend on allusion, meaning Joyce's specific and probably intentional incorporation of material from Virgil's work into his own. Although Joyce's intention can never be perfectly clear or certain and is arguably irrelevant to the readings in this book, it is nevertheless important for an understanding of the relationship between the *Aeneid* and *Ulysses* to trace the echoes of Virgil's words in the novel. Joyce was surely aware of at least the clearest examples of those echoes, and was largely in control of them. Any analysis of Virgilian material in *Ulysses*, even one that acknowledges that authorial intention is unknowable and that authors are never in full control of the texts they write at any moment, will touch on Joyce's writing process as a part of demonstrating the Virgilian aspects of passages in *Ulysses*. Nevertheless, the analyses in this book never stop at simple source hunting or identification of specific allusions as an end in itself. My identifications and readings of Virgilian

allusions in Joyce are always involved in a larger and more complex interaction between the texts.

The broader view of the dynamic relation between the *Aeneid* and *Ulysses* is less about allusion than it is about intertextuality. Stephen Hinds (1998) identifies “allusion” and “intertext” as the two poles of a continuum of approaches to Latin poetry. Readers committed to allusion, on the one hand, exclude from interpretation any incorporation of material that is accidental or outside of the author’s control. Readers committed to intertextuality, on the other hand, note that rhetorical commonplaces, generic characteristics, literary tropes, and other kinds of common linguistic or literary material may create confluences and relations between texts that are interpretable even if they are not fully intentional.¹⁴ The scholar who limits the discussion of Joyce’s allusions to those that are more or less demonstrably intentional and specific will identify and interpret only a small portion of the rich intertextuality of his work. The character known only as “the citizen,” for example, in the “Cyclops” episode of *Ulysses*, is the Joycean analogue of the Homeric Polyphemus, but he also incorporates elements of Virgil’s monster Cacus of *Aeneid* 8 (Schork 1997, 132–136), as I discuss in chapter 2 of this book. Moreover, Virgil’s Cacus alludes in turn to Homer’s Polyphemus (Münzer 1911, 31; Putnam 1965, 131; Galinsky 1966, 31n32; Hardie 1986, 115–116) and participates in a tradition of re-writing Homer’s Cyclops that includes among many others Euripides, Theocritus, and Ovid. The intertextuality of Joyce’s “Cyclops” is highly complex, and while it is clear that Joyce was aware of and in control of much of the allusivity, he would also likely be surprised by some of the confluences scholars note. The fact that Joyce as author could not fully control the complex intertextuality of his character does not empty that intertextuality of meaning, nor is it incumbent on a scholar to demonstrate specific intention for an instance of intertextuality to be significant.

While scholars of literature have grown comfortable with the use of the term “intertextuality” within the field of literary studies, in fact the term has much broader application. As Lowell Edmunds reminds scholars of Latin poetry, Julia Kristeva coined the term as part of an argument that all language is reuse, and it produces meaning by interacting with other uses of language (Kristeva 1985, 189; cited in Edmunds 2001, 8). The constant reuse of words and phrases means that any utterance at all, whether literary or not, takes part in a web of intertextuality. There is no precise threshold at which intertextuality becomes literary allusion. At the extreme of the intertextualist approach, everything is interpretable to such an extent that it becomes difficult to interpret anything at all. Hinds recommends a middle ground, neither going to an extreme of “philological fundamentalism,” that is, reading only what the scholar can prove to be intentional, or one of “intertextualist fundamentalism,” that is, refusing to attribute any significance to the

author. Hinds acknowledges the uses and partiality of both approaches (Hinds 1998, 47–51). At times my arguments in this book will lean toward allusion and at times toward intertext, but never one to the absolute exclusion of the other.

One way scholars have found to negotiate the difficulties of allusion and intertext is to apply reception theory or, as a related approach, reader-response theory. Because language produces meaning by interaction between uses of words, words do not carry communicable meaning within themselves. Rather, the meaning of language arises “at the point of reception.”¹⁵ Drawing on Hans-Georg Gadamer’s (1960) *Horizontverschmelzung*, or “fusion of horizons,” the so-called Konstanz school of Hans-Robert Jauss and Wolfgang Iser developed in the 1960s a method of interpretation that prioritizes the act of reading a text without eliminating the importance of the author, as extreme intertextualist approaches do.¹⁶ The production of meaning at the point of reception allows for a plurality of interpretations, but for Jauss and Iser that plurality is not without constraint. Various approaches, including, importantly, Stanley Fish’s “interpretive communities,” seek to understand how constraints on interpretation operate and how language produces meaning at the point of reception. Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to understand reception theory as an effort to eliminate the author or radicalize the indeterminacy of the meaning of texts. For readers attuned to allusion and intertext, reception theory offers a middle ground.

As is the case with the term “intertextuality,” the term “reception” has taken on a special meaning among scholars of Latin poetry. The field of “classical reception studies” has largely replaced the field that was until recently more commonly called “the classical tradition.”¹⁷ The importance that reception theory places on reading and the plurality of points of reception is an attractive, authorizing force for classical scholars anxious to read old texts in a new way and to appropriate for the discipline texts and histories of later periods. Replacing the idea of an inherited and largely unchanging “tradition” with an more open notion of the classics’ “reception” has been extraordinarily fruitful in the last two decades. Nevertheless, James Porter is right to point out that now the link between the Konstanz school and classical reception studies is often more a similarity of names than of theoretical approaches (Porter 2011, 474). In an instance of intertextuality, the same word in a different context means something different but acknowledges the significance of the other usage.

This book does not ignore the importance of reception theory, but neither does it make explicit and detailed use of Jauss and Iser beyond an acknowledgment of the importance of the Konstanz school as an authorizing springboard for classical reception studies. The method of my argument comes much more directly from the field of classical reception studies itself, and in particular from Charles Martindale’s

1993 call for the acceptance of reception as a focus in *Redeeming the Text* (Martindale 1993b). In spite of its foundational status in a rapidly developing field, the model of *Redeeming the Text* still works well for reading Virgil and Joyce together because studies of literary reception or literary influence comprise a minority of the work of classical reception studies. Although Martindale makes the case for reading works of literature as acts of reception, the majority of classical reception studies today focus more broadly on scholarly, popular, or political responses to classical texts, material culture, and history. Studies of literary influence or literary reception are now a specialized subfield of classical reception. As a study of a particular moment of interaction between Virgil and Joyce, this book situates itself at an intersection of allusion, intertext, and reception, partaking of all of them but embodying none fully.

Historicism and Presentism

Just as Hinds maps out a middle path between fundamentalist intertextualism and fundamentalist philology, so Martindale locates his “Jaussian model” of reception between “crude historicism” and “crude presentism” (Martindale 2006, 5). Martindale argues against the position in classical scholarship that a modern reader must, as much as possible, filter out modern ideas when reading classical literature.¹⁸ The true meaning of the *Aeneid*, according to this “crudely historicist” view, is available only to a reader with the mindset of a first-century Roman, or even of Virgil himself. The idea that our position as modern scholars is detrimental to the understanding of ancient texts is increasingly rare, not only because it is impossible to turn back time, but more importantly because scholars have recognized that readings of ancient texts are in fact enriched by a long tradition of reception. By virtue of our position in the twenty-first century CE, the *Aeneid* is not the same for us as it was for Romans of the first-century BCE, and we ought to embrace this difference rather than resist it. Without radicalizing presentism and ignoring the historical context of the production of the *Aeneid* altogether, we ought to ask what relevance the poem has and what interest it holds for us, not in spite of, but because of two thousand years of history. Eyes that have read Joyce’s novel pick out aspects of the *Aeneid* that may not otherwise stand out. The importance of the classical tradition lies not only in the influence of the *Aeneid* on *Ulysses*, but also in the question of how *Ulysses* can illuminate the continuing relevance of the *Aeneid*.

For several reasons, it is surprising that *Ulysses* would turn to the *Aeneid* for constructing an Irish national identity. First, the *Aeneid* is not an Irish text. While *Ulysses* does deal with specifically Irish material, it also uses Virgil’s ancient Roman

poem. Second, the *Aeneid* is a poem of empire, while *Ulysses* is a novel of a newly emerging nation-state. This is true on the level of form as well as content, since epic is the characteristic literary form of empire, while the novel is the characteristic literary form of the nation. Finally, it is odd that *Ulysses* works through issues of Irish nationalism with an ancient Roman text because nationalism is a specifically modern phenomenon. While nationalists frequently appeal to ancient texts in order to bolster their authority, *Ulysses* does not (at least not primarily) use the *Aeneid* in this way. Rather, *Ulysses* sets up a parallel between its own nationalist construction of Irish collective identity and the *Aeneid*'s ancient and imperialist construction of Roman collective identity. The intertextuality between the *Aeneid* and *Ulysses* reveals that Virgil's ancient construction of Roman and Italian identity shares central characteristics with modern territorial nationalisms.

The allusive dynamic between Virgil's *Aeneid* and Joyce's *Ulysses* offers an opportunity to explore the nature of the continuing relevance of the *Aeneid* in the modern world. Allusion is simultaneously an appropriation and a rejection of the model text (Bloom, 1997; Hinds 1998, 52–63). It is a game that is both competitive and cooperative.¹⁹ The alluding text acknowledges the model as worthy of imitation while at the same time superseding it. This act asserts the relevance of the model to the present context but also underlines the model text's inadequacy to the needs of the present. By alluding to the *Aeneid*, therefore, *Ulysses* affirms the relevance of Virgil's classical epic to Joyce's modernist novel, but also asserts its own novelty against the antiquity of the *Aeneid*. *Ulysses* both succeeds and supersedes the *Aeneid*, but the process incorporates the classical epic into the modernist novel. Conversely, the allusive incorporation of the *Aeneid* into *Ulysses* implies not only that aspects of the classical epic remain within the modernist novel, but also that aspects of the modernist novel were already present in the classical epic.

The Structure of This Book

Scholars of the past often want to construct narratives that move forward in time. Whether writing history or literary history, even a history of reception, we start at the beginning and move toward the present. This may seem intuitive, but it risks fixing an image of the past as it seems from the present as a true, timeless image. Classical reception studies as a field embraces the perspective of the present, rejecting the idea that the ideal reader is the reader situated within the historical, geographical, and cultural context of the original production of a text.²⁰ To say "This is what the *Aeneid* has always meant and here is how *Ulysses* uses it" would present the reading of the *Aeneid* as authoritative without the influence of *Ulysses*, when in fact my reading of the *Aeneid* has always been oriented

toward and conditioned by *Ulysses*. This book, therefore, avoids a linear and teleological account of Joyce's reception of Virgil. Rather than explicating the *Aeneid* and then using that explication to analyze *Ulysses*, the argument begins with *Ulysses* and moves freely back and forth between the two texts, using each to analyze the other.

Chapter 1 serves as an example and demonstration of this book's method. The chapter's focus is an analysis of an explicitly marked allusion in the "Aeolus" episode of *Ulysses* to Virgil's first *Eclogue*. In "Aeolus," Stephen Dedalus tells a story about two women in Dublin and offers two titles for it: "A Pisgah Site of Palestine" and "The Parable of the Plums." After hearing the story, professor MacHugh suggests an alternate title, *Deus nobis haec otia fecit*, alluding to a line from Virgil's first *Eclogue*. As I argue in chapter 1, MacHugh's title suggests a reading of both Stephen's story and the first *Eclogue* as allegories of the politics of land in Ireland. MacHugh's reading of Stephen's story is also a reading of the *Eclogue* according to which the politics of land in a colony resisting an imperial power are already present in Virgil's Roman poem. MacHugh's concerns in his present of late colonial Ireland condition his reading of Virgil and the politics of land following the triumviral confiscations. Such a reading encourages a reevaluation of the poem's response to the politics of land in triumviral Italy. It may seem strange to begin a book about *Ulysses* and the *Aeneid* with a chapter on *Ulysses* and the first *Eclogue*, but the issues of nationalism that emerge in the *Aeneid* are already present to some extent in Virgil's earlier poems, and a reading of the first *Eclogue* will set up the issues that emerge more fully and subtly in the *Aeneid*.

In chapter 2, I address the "Cyclops" episode of *Ulysses*. "Cyclops" is a crucial episode in the scholarly debate on the politics of war in *Ulysses*. According to Joyce's schema, the "Art" of the chapter is politics and the "Symbol" is Fenian (Ellmann 1972, 186–188). On one side of the debate over "Cyclops" is David Lloyd's "Adulteration and the Nation," which argues that the portrait of the militant nationalist citizen criticizes the nationalists for their oppressive agenda of Irish purity (Lloyd 1993, 88–124). Emer Nolan, on the other hand, argues in *James Joyce and Nationalism* that the episode is sympathetic to the citizen's nationalist cause (Nolan 1995, 96–113). Both sides of the debate make compelling arguments, but both ignore an important allusion to Virgil. R. J. Schork, in *Latin and Roman Culture in Joyce*, catalogues the parallels in the portrait of Joyce's citizen to Virgil's depiction of the monster Cacus in *Aeneid* 8 (Schork 1997, 132–136). Starting from Schork's catalogue, I show that analysis of the Cacus allusion is of great consequence for an understanding of the politics of "Cyclops." I argue that *Ulysses* aligns the citizen not only with the villain Cacus, thus rejecting the nationalist side in the war, but also with the heroic liberator Hercules, thus supporting the nationalist cause.

The battle between Hercules and Cacus in *Aeneid* 8 is itself a politically engaged narrative (Putnam 1965, 105–150; Galinsky 1966). Aeneas has come to Pallanteum seeking allies for his war against Turnus. He finds Evander and his people celebrating a festival in honor of Hercules, and Evander explains its origin in the story of the monster Cacus, who terrorized Pallanteum until Hercules killed him (*Aeneid* 8.102–279). The episode presents Hercules as a hero, but one unable to integrate himself into the community he has liberated. Hercules's skill is killing, not civilizing. The figure of Hercules illustrates the disjunction between war and politics. A fighter, like Hercules and Joyce's citizen, is useful during wartime but unsuited to the peaceful politics of constructing a community. *Ulysses* demonstrates the need for Irish liberation, but also foresees the tragic inability of the militant nationalists to govern peacefully.

Though Andras Ungar suggests in *Joyce's Ulysses as National Epic* that Joyce has Virgil to thank for introducing politics into epic (Ungar 2002, 2–3), scholars of the politics of *Ulysses* have for the most part ignored the role of allusions to Virgil. Political readings are interested in the modern phenomenon of Irish nationalism and not in ancient Roman politics. Like the citizen, Joyce scholars narrow their focus to what is specifically Irish in *Ulysses*, rejecting the novel's transnational element. My argument demonstrates that "Cyclops" devalues the element of Irish uniqueness in nationalism in favor of Ireland's entry into a European community of nations. The episode implicitly argues that Ireland should be an independent nation, but one on equal footing with other nations. Using Virgil's European classic to engage with Irish nationalism emphasizes what Ireland has in common with the rest of Europe. "Cyclops" uses Hercules and Cacus to criticize the drive for Irish purity in nationalism while still supporting the cause of national liberation.

Chapter 3 of this book analyzes Virgil's construction of ancient roots for Rome using Joyce's treatment of the revivalists' construction of pure, ancient roots for the emerging Irish nation. I argue that the drive to find ancient territorial roots for a new state, a drive Joyce's "Cyclops" episode exposes and mocks, is a Virgilian strategy for overcoming the divisions of Roman civil wars and for constructing a unified Italian identity. Rather than resisting the Roman imperialism of the *Aeneid*, "Cyclops" aligns the *Aeneid* with nationalism. In "Cyclops," *Ulysses* resists the *Aeneid* not as a representative of the British and Roman Empires, but as an analogue of Irish revivalist nationalism. "Cyclops" criticizes the revivalist drive to invent an ancient Ireland that naturalizes and homogenizes the modern nation-state. It is an almost universal feature of nationalism that it invents an ancient or mythical past to justify the cultural unity of the modern state (Hobsbawm and Ranger 1992; Anderson 2006, 9–36). When theorists such as Benedict Anderson and Eric Hobsbawm insist that the nation is modern, they mean that nation-states as we

know them did not exist before the late eighteenth century, but the force of their insistence comes from the necessity to refute the specific claims of modern nations that they have ancient roots. In chapter 3, I argue that the *Aeneid* makes a claim to ancient roots territorially attached to Italy in a manner analogous to modern nations asserting ancient and essential connections to particular territories.

In *Aeneid* 8, Virgil places the battle of Actium at the center of Aeneas's shield (*Aeneid* 8.675–728). The passage, in accord with Augustus's own interpretation of the battle, depicts the conflict between Octavian and Antony as a clash between Italy and the Orient (Quint 1993, 21–31; Galinsky 1996, 74–76). The presentation of Actium as a battle against foreigners helps to promote the image of Augustus as the leader of a united Italy—an image threatened by the fact that he had secured his position by defeating the armies of Antony, even if Antony was geographically associated with the East. Seen from this perspective, references to civil war in the *Aeneid* undermine the Augustan imperative to forget the civil aspects of his war against Antony. I argue, however, that the presentation of war in the *Aeneid* as fratricide does not undermine Augustan ideology, but instead helps to construct the image of a unified Italy.

The image of a unified Italy is new to Rome in the Augustan period (Crawford 1996; David 1996; Mouritsen 1998). Most Italians did not gain Roman citizenship until the Social War, and the boundaries of Italy as a community of Roman citizens were not fixed until the time of Augustus. Moreover, the Social War ended at the beginning of a period of civil wars, with the result that the newly united Italy was immediately fractured. The civil wars, however, involved Roman citizens of the whole peninsula, and when Octavian won at Actium he united not just Rome as a city-state, but all Italy as a Roman state. In this respect, the civil wars and their outcome show that Italy had become a single community. The presentation of such wars as civil wars, even fratricidal wars, emphasizes that Italy is a natural whole divided by the tragedy of war.

Leading up to and during the great conflict of the second half of the *Aeneid*, there are many references to civil war and fratricide (Pöschl 1962, 14; Otis 1964, 315; Lyne 1987, 100; Cairns 1989, 92). Brooks Otis writes of the Latin war, “It is not only war but civil war” (Otis 1964, 315). Despite the poem's attempt to condition its readers to imagine the Latin war as civil, it is not. The Trojans, the Arcadians, and the Latins are different peoples. Even though Jupiter promises that they will one day share language and customs, this day is far in the future (*Aeneid* 12.830–840). The Latin war only seems like a civil war because a thousand years later the Romans will inhabit a united Italy. Virgil's fratricidal presentation of Aeneas's conquest of Latium overwrites a problem in the legend of Rome's Trojan origins. The idea that Rome is a foreign power in Italy highlights Rome's conquest

of the surrounding areas (Gruen 1992, 44). Conquest breeds division and discontent. The image of a unified Italy demands that ancient wars of conquest be made civil. In this way, paradoxically, references to civil war in the *Aeneid* do not undercut but rather construct the unified Italy of Augustan ideology.

In chapter 4, I examine the systematic allusion of “Circe” to *Aeneid* 6. I begin with the appearance of the ghost of Bloom’s son Rudy (*Ulysses* 15.4955–4967).²¹ With Rudy, Joyce alludes to Marcellus, Augustus’s dead heir, who in *Aeneid* 6 is the culmination of Aeneas’s vision of Roman heroes (*Aeneid* 6.863–892). Marcellus embodied the hope of a smooth succession, and his ghost recalls the uncertainty of the future (Syme 1939, 341–348; Eder 1990, 120–122; Raaffaub and Samons 1990, 428–433; Crook 1996, 81–87; Otis 1964, 303–304; Burke 1979, 228; Williams 1983, 214; O’Hara 1990, 168). By associating Rudy with Marcellus, Joyce foreshadows the instability of the new, postcolonial Irish state. This chapter examines questions about imperialism in *Ulysses* and the *Aeneid*. In “Circe” Joyce confronts the contradiction between the genuine optimism of the anti-colonial movement and the reality of Ireland’s postimperial struggles (Duffy 1994, 133). This mirrors the scholarly readings of book six of the *Aeneid* that isolate Virgil’s complex relation to the violent reality of civil war and the optimistic vision of peace and foreign conquest under the principate (Feeney 1986; O’Hara 1990, 163–172). Joyce’s foreboding critique of violence in the newly liberated colony on the margins of Europe looks for a model in Virgil’s critique of violence in the center of Augustan Rome.

The coincidence of patrilineal and political discontinuities in “Circe” emphasizes some important distinctions between the Irish and Roman states. Bloom, despite the fact that “Circe” at one point makes him the sovereign of a global empire (*Ulysses* 15.1470–1956), is a potential citizen of a republican nation-state. Augustus, despite his assertions that the *princeps* is merely a prominent citizen of a republican state, is the sovereign of an ecumenical empire. As sovereign, Augustus is the *Pater Patriae* (the father of the nation) a title that Augustus took in 2 BCE (Eder 1990). The link between patrilineal and political discontinuity in the *Aeneid* is a direct one, whereas *Ulysses* uses the *Aeneid* to make an indirect connection.

Nevertheless, in spite of the difference, the symbolic link between patriline and state is as necessary for Ireland as it is for Rome. In Imperial Rome, the sovereign becomes a symbolic embodiment of the state, and thus the death of the heir is not only a practical but also a symbolic difficulty. In “Circe,” the allusion to *Aeneid* 6 shows that the continuity of the race—as it is embodied in the patriline of the citizen Bloom—is an important element in the image of the nation. As “Cyclops” problematizes Irish nationalism’s imagined racial continuity by introducing the Hungarian Jew Bloom into the citizen body, “Circe” does so by associating Bloom’s failure as a father with the future of the Irish state. Like “Cyclops,”

“Circe” also uses the *Aeneid* to articulate the conflicts and contradictions of Irish nationalism.

In chapter 5, I turn to a reading of the *Aeneid* suggested by “Circe.” In “Circe,” the failure of the father is not only a patrilineal and political failure, but also a failure of signification. The textual heterogeneity and discontinuity of Joyce’s novel is most intense in “Circe” (Nadel 1990; Duffy 1994, 133). The patrilineal discontinuity of Bloom’s failure as a father and as a symbolic father of the nation bleeds into the textual discontinuity of the episode. The heterogeneity of the nation and the symbolic failure of the father are also the heterogeneity of the text and the failure of the sign. In chapter 5, I argue that the *Aeneid*, and book 6 in particular, also thematizes paternal failure, textual heterogeneity, and a failure of signification.

Aeneid 6, in which Aeneas visits his dead father, is framed by two dead sons. At the end of the book the figure of Marcellus, the dead heir, links patrilineal and political discontinuity. At the beginning of the book, the doors of the temple of Apollo depict Daedalus’s flight from Crete. When Daedalus landed in Cumae from Crete he sculpted his story on the doors, but he failed to portray the death of his son, Icarus (*Aeneid* 6.14–33). The beginning of *Aeneid* 6, then, links patrilineal discontinuity to the failure of signification. The problem of signification continues in Aeneas’s dealings with the Sibyl. At first Aeneas worries that the Sibyl’s writing will be unintelligible, so he asks her to speak (*Aeneid* 6.74–76; Fowler 1997, 267–270). Her speech, however, fails to communicate anything new to Aeneas. Aeneas responds to her prophecy, “non ulla laborum, / o virgo, nova mi facies inopinave surgit; / omnia praecepi atque animo mecum ante peregi” (“no new or unanticipated labor, maiden, rises before me; I foresaw everything and went through it before in my mind”; *Aeneid* 6.103–105). And even when the Sibyl does not speak but instead takes Aeneas through the underworld, they exit not through the gate of true shades, but through the gate of false dreams, casting doubt on the truth of the experience (*Aeneid* 6.893–902; Otis 1964, 304; Tarrant 1982; West 1987; O’Hara 1990, 170–172; Reed 2007, 313). From beginning to end, *Aeneid* 6 stresses the impossibility of semantic communication. In the *Aeneid* as in *Ulysses*, patrilineal and political discontinuity is also semantic discontinuity.

In “Cyclops” and “Circe,” *Ulysses* articulates its relation to Irish nationalism by means of the *Aeneid*. This is surprising because the *Aeneid* is not an Irish text. Moreover, the *Aeneid* is a poem of empire, while *Ulysses* is working through an anti-imperial revolution. Ultimately, *Ulysses* refuses to valorize an idealized and unified Irish culture as a basis for building an anti-colonial nation-state. Instead, Joyce’s novel demonstrates the ability of Irish culture to stand equally with other European national cultures. The intertextuality of *Ulysses* and the *Aeneid*, however,

moves in two directions. *Ulysses* is successful in its use of the *Aeneid* because the *Aeneid* itself is concerned with issues of culture and national identity. Though in Virgil's epic Rome does not seek to enter a community of nations, it does seek to construct an imagined community of Roman citizen-subjects and to extend that community throughout a territorial state. The *Aeneid* projects its imagined community into a legitimizing and naturalizing heroic past; it articulates the fragmented and divided subjectivity of the emerging state; and ultimately, it constructs out of discontinuity an image of Roman collective identity.

1

Joyce's "Aeolus" and the Semicolonial Virgil

The first time that *Ulysses* mentions Virgil by name is in chapter 7 of the novel, the "Aeolus" episode (*Ulysses* 7.1053).¹ Although in this allusion Joyce refers to Virgil's first *Eclogue* rather than the *Aeneid*, the dynamics in play between "Aeolus" and the first *Eclogue* are similar to the dynamics that play out more fully between later episodes of *Ulysses* and the *Aeneid*. "Aeolus" takes place in and around the offices of the *Freeman's Journal*, a nationalist newspaper. Near the end of the episode, Stephen tells a story about two women of Dublin, Anne Kearns and Florence MacCabe, who save their money for a visit to Nelson's Pillar, a 121-foot tower topped by a thirteen-foot statue of Lord Horatio Nelson, the British admiral who defeated Napoleon at Trafalgar in 1805 (*Ulysses* 7.921–1075). The tower offers a view of Dublin to anyone willing to pay three pence for admission and climb to the top. Kearns and MacCabe buy some snacks—some bread, brawn, and twenty-four plums—and climb laboriously to the top of the tower. At the top, however, they are disappointed by the view, so they simply eat their plums and spit the seeds out onto the city below. When Myles Crawford, the newspaper editor, asks Stephen for the title of the story, professor MacHugh suggests *Deus nobis haec otia fecit* ("A god has granted us this leisure"), while Stephen himself says that he calls it either "A Pisgah Sight of Palestine," or "The Parable of the Plums." The newspaper-style headline for the section reads, "Virgilian, Says Pedagogue. Sophomore Plumps for Old Man Moses." MacHugh's title is indeed Virgilian, quoting a line from Virgil's first *Eclogue*. The episode shows a contest for the meaning of a story between the author, who reads it as a biblical tale, and a professor, who reads it as Virgilian. MacHugh's Virgilian reading, as I will show, is a good one, using Virgil to read Stephen's story as an allegory of recent Irish nationalist politics.

It is no longer controversial, as it might have been thirty years ago, to claim that *Ulysses* is extensively concerned with Irish nationalism. It has never been controversial to argue that Joyce uses classical Greek and Roman literature and culture in *Ulysses*. What may still be controversial, however, is to claim that Joyce

is using classical allusion to engage with Irish nationalism. On the one hand, scholars of Joyce's involvement with nationalism focus on the construction of purely Irish traditions, just as nationalists themselves do. On the other hand, scholars of Joyce's classical allusions generally assume that they are self-explanatory once pointed out and make little attempt to interpret them, especially along political lines. What the Virgilian reading of the Parable of the Plums shows is that there is not a divide between the politics of *Ulysses* and its use of classical literature. It is precisely through classical literature that *Ulysses* develops its politics. The short and relatively self-contained Parable of the Plums and the similarly short and self-contained first *Eclogue* offer a brief model of the kind of interaction that occurs on a larger scale between *Ulysses* and the *Aeneid*.

Ulysses is deeply engaged with both contemporary Irish politics and classical literature. Joyce wrote the novel during the War of Independence and published it within two months of the establishment of the Irish Free State. He set the action in 1904, after the failure of Parnell's hope for a parliamentary solution and before the Easter Rising of 1916. Recent scholarship has emphasized the complexity of the novel's relationship with nationalism (Nolan 1995; Attridge and Howes 2000; Gibson 2002). It portrays the injustice of British rule in Ireland but also undermines and lampoons nationalist characters and positions. It is a nationalist novel that refuses to conform to major aspects of the nationalist movement.

Ulysses also makes extensive use of Latin literature and Roman history (Schork 1997). If not for the title of the novel and for Joyce's notes and schemata, we might struggle to see how pervasive the pattern of Homer's *Odyssey* is in the novel. The same is not true of such Roman authors as Virgil and Ovid. Joyce came to the Greek language late and struggled with it, but Latin was one of his best subjects in school (Schork 1997, 245–247). The clearest classical allusions and models in *Ulysses* are more often Roman than Greek. The novel is obviously dependent on Latin literature and Roman culture, and yet it declares itself to be Greek. Joyce struggled with the issue of the relationship between Latin and Greek. The Irish nationalist intellectuals of the early twentieth century, including especially Yeats, valorized Greek over Latin, often identifying British imperialism with Roman imperialism (Stanford 1976, 94–109; Farrell 2001, 32–36; Farrell 2012). Joyce, however, also recognized the liberating potential of Latin in a culture of Catholic institutions opposed to British Protestantism (Farrell 2012).

There was, by Joyce's time, a long and complex history of associating the Roman and British Empires and of doing so especially through Virgil. There are examples of supporters of British imperialism using Rome as a positive precedent or a justification of British aims, and also examples of opponents of British imperialism using Rome as a negative model or a way to explore the problems of imperialism

(Vasunia 2005; Vasunia 2009). In Ireland in particular, the dynamics of Roman and British imperialism were complicated by the influence of Catholicism. On the one hand, the association between the British Empire, Roman imperialism, and the colonialist uses of classical education pushed the Irish nationalists toward a purely Irish tradition that rejected English classicism and invented a pure Ireland under the pretense of rediscovering ancient roots. On the other hand, the identification of the Irish nationalist resistance with the Catholic Church against English Protestantism linked Ireland with Rome and with the Latin language.² As much as the nationalists of the Gaelic Revival aimed to build a nationalist movement in the Irish language, in practice English was the only language available.³ Similarly, although the Irish nationalist intellectuals might ideally have rejected the Latin language and Roman culture, these were the cultural tools they had at their disposal for working through the construction of a nationalist identity.

In light of the Irish modernist preference for Greek literature and culture over Roman, and in light of the association of British and Roman imperialism, it is surprising to find so much Latin in general and Virgil in particular in *Ulysses*. In spite of Joyce's extensive use of Latin, both from classical sources and his own composition, from his school days through his entire career, *Ulysses* does its best to appear Greek rather than Latin.⁴ It is even more surprising to find the *Aeneid* being used in *Ulysses* as a model for the construction of a postcolonial national identity rather than as a negative example of Roman imperialism. At first glance, *Ulysses* seems to participate actively in the preference for Greek over Latin. Not only does it use the *Odyssey* as a structural model and name one of its protagonists, Stephen Dedalus, after a Greek hero, but characters in the novel also represent Greek as an aesthetic culture of resistance to the practicality and imperialism of Rome (Farrell 2012). The novel's romantic longing for Greek and resentment of Latin appears early in the first chapter of the novel, when Buck Mulligan enthuses about the beauty of the Greek language and insists that he must teach it to Stephen: "Ah, Dedalus, the Greeks! I must teach you. You must read them in the original. *Thalatta! Thalatta!* She is our great sweet mother" (*Ulysses* 1.79–80). Shortly afterwards, Stephen expresses his resentment of the Catholic Church when he complains to Haines that he serves two masters: "The imperial British state, Stephen answered, his colour rising, and the holy Roman catholic and apostolic church" (*Ulysses* 1.643–644). Although he does not reject ancient Rome and classical Latin explicitly here, he does reject Catholicism (and its association with Latin) as a potential galvanizing force for Irish nationalism. Irish Catholicism is just as oppressive for Stephen as British imperialism.

The importance of the relationship between Greek and Latin for the Irish nationalist intellectuals is even more apparent when it is juxtaposed with the

relationship between the Irish and English languages. Mulligan argues that Stephen's lack of Greek is a significant failing. Shortly after this criticism, Stephen's lack of Greek is mirrored in the milkwoman's lack of Irish. When an old woman delivering milk arrives at the Martello tower, where Stephen lives with Mulligan, the visiting English student Haines speaks to her in Irish. Once Stephen and Mulligan have explained to her that Haines is speaking Irish and he thinks that the Irish ought to speak Irish, she agrees, "Sure we ought to, the old woman said, and I'm ashamed I don't speak the language myself" (*Ulysses* 1.433–434). Here the British Haines, like the Irish nationalists, acts on his assumption of a pure and ancient Irish identity, but runs up against the reality that deanglicizing Ireland is no longer practically possible. What would be the language of resistance—Irish—fails practically. Similarly, among the intellectuals, Catholic education had made Latin widespread but Greek relatively rare. In spite of his resentment of both Rome and Britain, Stephen's Catholic education has provided him with the only tools he has to confront the imperialism he resents. Stephen must use for his resistance English and Latin, the languages of empires, rather than Irish and Greek, the languages that the nationalists cast as languages of resistance. In writing *Ulysses* Joyce must use English rather than Irish, and in his linguistic classical allusions he must rely more on his excellent Latin than on his poor Greek.

The nationalist intellectual resistance to Rome and identification with Greek is most explicit in the character of professor MacHugh in "Aeolus." Before Stephen tells his story, the conversation in the newspaper office turns to the subject of the Roman Empire. MacHugh argues that the English are the inheritors of Rome:

—Wait a moment, professor MacHugh said, raising two quiet claws. We mustn't be led away by words, by sounds of words. We think of Rome, imperial, imperious, imperative.

He extended elocutionary arms from frayed stained shirtcuffs, pausing:

—What was their civilization? Vast, I allow: but vile. *Cloacae*: sewers. The jews in the wilderness and on the mountaintop said: *It is meet to be here. Let us build an altar to Jehovah*. The Roman, like the Englishman who follows in his footsteps, brought to every shore on which he set his foot (on our shore he never set it) only his cloacal obsession. He gazed about him in his toga and he said: *It is meet to be here. Let us construct a watercloset*. (*Ulysses* 7.484–495).

MacHugh as an Irish nationalist intellectual of the early twentieth century participates in the widespread practice of linking the Roman and British Empires, and he does so as a means of demonstrating the vileness of the British Empire rather

than as a means of justifying and legitimizing British imperialism. MacHugh is a professor of Latin, but he does not love his subject. He rather uses his knowledge of ancient Rome to inform his resistance to Roman culture.

While it might be tempting to take MacHugh's resentment of Rome as indicative of Joyce's attitude as well, a closer reading suggests that Joyce's attitude is more complex than this. First, MacHugh is not the only participant in the conversation, and the lawyer J. J. O'Molloy takes care to point out that in addition to the harm of Roman imperialism, there are also benefits. He points out that "We have also Roman law" (*Ulysses* 7.499–500), suggesting that the influence of Rome is not entirely negative. More importantly, however, Joyce has taken the phrase "cloacal obsession" (*Ulysses* 7.493) from a 1917 H. G. Wells review of *Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. Wells wrote, "Like Swift and another living Irish writer, Mr. Joyce has a cloacal obsession. He would bring back into the general picture of life aspects which modern drainage and modern decorum have taken out of ordinary intercourse and conversation" (Wells 1917, 159; quoted in Gifford 1989, ad loc.). When MacHugh criticizes the Romans for their cloacal obsession, Joyce is appropriating Wells's criticism and casting himself in the role of the Romans. Wells points out that Joyce exposes what usually remains hidden, and here Joyce suggests that he is exposing in Irish culture the presence of Rome that MacHugh would reject.

Sewers, after all, are a hidden benefit. The construction of new sewers in Paris (Reid 1991), London (Johnson 2006), and Dublin (O'Brien 1982) in the second half of the nineteenth century effectively dealt with persistent cholera outbreaks, and Joyce may be alluding here to the cloacal novel *Les Misérables*, in which Hugo suggests that the sewers of Paris are the inheritor of the *cloaca maxima* and argues that the sewer is the mechanism that exposes all the foul truth of civilization and history (5.2.2; Radford 1994).⁵ The possibility of an allusion to Hugo is strengthened by MacHugh's next comment on Rome and England:

—We were always loyal to lost causes, the professor said. Success for us is the death of the intellect and of the imagination. We were never loyal to the successful. We serve them. I teach the blatant Latin language. I speak the tongue of a race the acme of whose mentality is the maxim: time is money. Material domination. *Domine!* Lord! Where is the spirituality? Lord Jesus? Lord Salisbury? A sofa in a westend club. But the Greek! (*Ulysses* 7.554–559)

MacHugh cites "time is money" as the maxim representing the height of English civilization, perhaps unaware of the usual attribution to the Greek Theophrastus.⁶ The attribution of the importance of this phrase particularly to the English comes

from *Les Misérables*, in which a drunk Grantaire in the Café Musain rants against many civilizations (including Athens) and exclaims, "Take away Time is money and what is left of England?" (3.4.4; quoted in Gifford 1989, ad loc.). MacHugh's condemnation of England and Rome is again problematic. He takes his condemnation of "Time is money" from a passage that also condemns Athens in a novel that praises sewers as that which reveals what civilization would rather keep secret. And Joyce's own "cloacal obsession" means that *Ulysses* also reveals what civilization would otherwise hide.

In "Aeolus," what MacHugh fails to hide is the presence of Roman culture and the Latin language within Irish nationalism. Although he professes Latin, he argues that Roman culture is vile and instead casts Greek as the intellectual language of resistance. The casting of Irish as a language of resistance is readily apparent in the so-called Gaelic or Irish Revival, but the representation of Greek as a language of resistance to imperialism is somewhat less obvious. MacHugh, however, follows up his rejection of Rome with an explicit endorsement of Greece:

A smile brightened his darkrimmed eyes, lengthened his long lips.

—The Greek! He said again. *Kyrios!* Shining word! The vowels the Semite and the Saxon know not.⁷ *Kyrie!* The radiance of the intellect. I ought to profess Greek, the language of the mind. *Kyrie eleison!* The closet-maker and the cloacemaker will never be lords of our spirit. We are liege subjects of the catholic chivalry of Europe that foundered at Trafalgar and of the empire of the spirit, not an *imperium*, that went under with the Athenian fleets at Aegospotami. Yes, yes. They went under. Pyrrhus, misled by an oracle, made a last attempt to revive the fortunes of Greece. Loyal to a lost cause. (*Ulysses* 7.560–570)

Like Mulligan in "Telemachus," MacHugh has a great enthusiasm for Greek. He opposes the Greek language to empire, and the Roman Empire in particular, when he points out that Greek was the language of an "empire of the spirit, not an *imperium*." The cloacemaker and the closetmaker refer to the Romans and the English, who, according to MacHugh may rule Ireland but will never capture the spirit of the Irish. He furthermore characterizes Greek as the language and culture of resistance to imperialism when he represents Pyrrhus as a last hope for the Greeks against Roman expansion.

There are, however, some problems with MacHugh's argument. First, he points out that Ireland is subject to the Catholic Church, and although his exclamations of *Kyrie eleison* evoke the Greek of the New Testament, the language of the "catholic chivalry of Europe" was not Greek, but Latin. He is pointing out a dual

inheritance—on the one hand a Greek empire of spirit and on the other a catholic chivalry—and these two inheritances do not readily match each other as a linguistically Greek opposition to the Roman Empire. Secondly, he identifies the Greek empire of spirit as specifically Athenian, and suggests that the Athenian loss to the Spartans in the Peloponnesian War was one of the historical moments when the Irish/Greek cause was lost. This means that the Greek opposition is specifically Athenian and opposed to other Greeks rather than any historical empire. The suggestion, then, that Pyrrhus made a final effort to revive the Greek cause depends on an unhistorical association of Pyrrhus and Athens. Although MacHugh is enthusiastic, his logic is flawed, and while it might be tempting to associate MacHugh, as an Irish intellectual uncomfortable with Latin and regretting that he does not profess Greek, with Joyce himself, MacHugh's argument for Greek over Latin rather exposes the constructed nature of Greek as a language of opposition to imperialism.

The dynamics of Greek, Latin, Ireland, and Britain are further complicated when Virgil makes his first appearance in the episode. Still before Stephen tells his story, MacHugh and O'Molloy are discussing John F. Taylor's 1901 speech comparing the Irish to the Israelites in Egypt (*Ulysses* 7.791–911). MacHugh sums up his thoughts:

—Come along, Stephen, the professor said. That is fine, isn't it? It has the prophetic vision. *Fuit Ilium!* The sack of windy Troy. Kingdoms of this world. The masters of the Mediterranean are fellaheen today. (*Ulysses* 7.909–911)

MacHugh returns to his previous thoughts on lost causes and suggests that the Greeks (and Romans), once masters of the Mediterranean, have given way to "fellaheen." They have, in a possible pun, "fallen" from the heights.⁸ Perhaps nostalgically thinking of the Greeks as the former masters of the Mediterranean, he cites the great Greek victory at Troy, but he does so not through Homer, but through Virgil. *Fuit Ilium* ("Troy is no more") is a quotation of *Aeneid* 2.325 (Gifford 1989, ad loc.), during the sack of Troy. When Aeneas, trying to save the city, asks Panthus where the rally point is, Panthus replies that the city is lost. Here MacHugh's lost cause is that of the Trojans, ancestors of the Romans, and his access to the Greek world is mediated by Virgil and Latin. He concludes his discussion of the nationalist speech of Taylor not with Homer or Greek, but with Virgil and Rome.

In spite of his efforts to reject Latin in favor of Greek as the language of resistance, as the conversation in the newspaper office continues, MacHugh continues

to use Latin rather than Greek to engage with Irish nationalist politics. He takes his title for Stephen's story from the first *Eclogue* (Senn 1989a) and thereby suggests through allusion that Stephen's story is about the plight of dispossessed Irish farmers. The first *Eclogue* discusses the problem of land confiscations in Italy (Fredricksmeyer 1966; Winterbottom 1976; DuQuesnay 1981; Schmidt 1998). Roman generals rewarded their veterans with land, dispossessing the previous landholders, and there were confiscations in Mantua in 41 BCE following the Battle of Philippi in 42 BCE. Virgil's poem, composed in the wake of these confiscations, is a conversation between a dispossessed farmer, Meliboeus, and his neighbor, Tityrus, who has escaped dispossession at least partially through the intercession of a powerful man from Rome. It is this man from Rome who is the "god" who has granted leisure. The poem opens with the following exchange:

M. Tityre, tu patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi
 siluestrem tenui Musam meditaris auena;
 nos patriae finis et dulcia linquimus arua.
 nos patriam fugimus; tu Tityre, lentus in umbra
 formosam resonare doces Amaryllida siluas.
 T. O Meliboe, *deus nobis haec otia fecit*.
 namque erit ille mihi semper deus, illius aram
 saepe tener nostris ab ouibus imbuet agnus.
 ille meas errare boues, ut cernis, et ipsum
 ludere quae uellem calamo permisit agresti.

Eclogue 1.1–10

M. Tityrus, you, reclining beneath a roof of broad beech, play a sylvan song on a delicate reed; I leave behind the sweet fields and borders of my homeland. I am exiled from my homeland; you, Tityrus, relaxed in the shade, teach the woods to call beautiful Amaryllis.
 T. O, Meliboeus, *a god has granted us this leisure*. For he will always be a god to me, often a tender lamb from our flocks will stain his altar. That one has allowed my cattle to roam, as you see, and me to play what I like on my country reed pipe.

This is not an apolitical scene of leisurely poetry, but a scene that draws a politically pointed contrast between the farmer able to continue to live on his land, and the farmer unjustly evicted from it.

When MacHugh names Stephen's story *Deus nobis haec otia fecit*, he introduces the politics of land into his reading of it. Land was an important issue in

Irish politics leading up to 1904 (Lyons 1971, 160–177). In the 1870s an agricultural depression caused English landlords to evict thousands of Irish tenant farmers. In response to this crisis Michael Davitt founded the Irish National Land League. The Land League's campaign of boycotts and acts of violence drove Irish politics through the following years in two ways. First, Charles Stewart Parnell, the Irish nationalist leader, rose to power by campaigning on the land issue in 1880. Second, the so-called land war resulted in the British parliament passing two Coercion Bills designed to grant "special powers to deal with agrarian violence" (Lyons 1971, 162). The British, in the end, were forced to jail the leaders of the Land League, including Parnell, in 1881 and 1882. For professor MacHugh in 1904, the land war must have been a disappointment. Despite the increasingly effective land reforms, including the Wyndham Act of 1903, which gave Irish tenant farmers subsidized loans with which to buy the land they worked, the land agitation had failed to achieve its ultimate goal of Irish independence.

MacHugh, an intellectual and an Irish nationalist, by giving Stephen's story a title that alludes to Virgil's poem, is reading the story as an allegory of the recent land war. Virgil's poem contrasts two farmers, Tityrus and Meliboeus, and so also Stephen's story contrasts two Irishwomen, Anne Kearns and Florence MacCabe. When Stephen introduces the two women, MacHugh interrupts with the observation that they are opposites, "Antithesis, the professor said nodding twice" (*Ulysses* 7.952). Stephen explains the contrast: "Anne Kearns has the lumbago for which she rubs on Lourdes water, given her by a lady who got a bottleful from a passionist father. Florence MacCabe takes a crubeen and a bottle of double X for supper every Saturday" (*Ulysses* 7.948–951). The two correspond to the conflicting images of the Irish peasantry as pious and industrious, on the one hand, and drunk and lazy on the other. The once industrious Irish appear lazy because outside forces have deprived them of their livelihood. The contrast, then, is between the pious and industrious and the dispossessed and therefore out-of-work. This is similar to the contrast between Tityrus, who through his industry has managed to save his livelihood, and Meliboeus, who does not have the luck or strength to withstand the unjust eviction, and so is doomed to unemployment.

The two women in the story have been saving their money to climb Nelson's pillar. Stephen says, "They want to see the views of Dublin from the top of Nelson's pillar. They save up three and tenpence in a red tin letterbox moneybox" (*Ulysses* 7.931–932). Tityrus tells us that the ability to save up the profits of industry enables one to achieve freedom. He says:

Libertas, quae sera tamen respexit inertem,
candidior postquam tondenti barba cadebat,

respexit tamen et longo post tempore venit,
postquam nos Amaryllis habet, Galatea reliquit.
namque (fatebor enim) dum me Galatea tenebat,
nec spes libertatis erat nec cura peculi.
quamuis multa meis exiret uictima saeptis,
pinguis et ingratae premeretur caseus urbi,
non umquam grauis aera domum mihi dextra redibat.

Eclogue 1.27–35

Freedom, which although late has looked upon a lazy one, after a rather white beard was falling when I was shaving, has nevertheless looked upon me and it has come after a long time. Now that Amaryllis has me, Galatea has let me go. For, I swear it, while Galatea held me there was no hope of freedom or care for savings. Although many victims went forth from my pens, and rich cheese was pressed for the ungrateful town, never did my hand return home heavy with money.

Like the Irishwomen, Tityrus has managed to save up enough money for what he wants. This is not easy to do when one's mistress, or landlord, takes all of one's profits. The Irish peasant farmer forced to pay rent had little hope of saving enough to buy land. The achievement of the Wyndham Act was to grant low interest loans to Irish tenants so that they could buy land and use the profits to pay back their loans (Lyons 1971, 218–219). This, in effect, allowed the Irish tenant, like the Roman Tityrus, to buy freedom.

The purchase of the Irishwomen in Stephen's story is admission to Nelson's Pillar. If Tityrus says that savings buy freedom, then Kearns's and MacCabe's admission to Nelson's Pillar should also represent freedom. It does, insofar as freedom in the colony is to take the position of the colonizer. Nelson, the English admiral who won at Trafalgar, is a suitable representation of British rule in Ireland. MacHugh himself earlier in "Aeolus" acknowledges the importance of Nelson's role when he asserts, "We are liege subjects of the catholic chivalry of Europe that foundered at Trafalgar" (*Ulysses* 7.565–566). Stephen's Irishwomen seek to join Nelson at the top of the pillar.⁹ They want to take the place of authority that the English Lord Nelson currently holds, just as in the land war the Irish tenant sought to take the place of the landlord, and more generally in the anti-colonial struggle, the Irish nationalists sought to take the place of the British government in Ireland.¹⁰

Kearns and MacCabe do succeed in making the journey to the top of the tower, although Stephen emphasizes the difficulty of the climb:

They give two threepenny bits to the gentleman at the turnstile and begin to waddle slowly up the winding staircase, grunting, encouraging each other, afraid of the dark, panting, one asking the other have you the brawn, praising God and the Blessed Virgin, threatening to come down, peeping at the airslits. Glory be to God. They had no idea it was that high. (*Ulysses* 7.941–947)

In spite of their effort, however, the view from the top of the tower is disappointing. They are doubly uncomfortable. On the one hand, they cannot look down because "they are afraid the pillar will fall" (*Ulysses* 7.1010); and on the other hand they cannot look up at the statue of Nelson because "it gives them a crick in their necks" (*Ulysses* 7.1023). By the end of the story, Kearns and MacCabe have made some progress but still find themselves in the shadow of Nelson. Similarly, Parnell and the leaders of the Land League had made progress in the land war, but, having been imprisoned in 1881 and 1882, found themselves forcibly reminded that the English were still in charge.

Parnell and Davitt were frustrated under English rule, but the political gains they made were also challenged from "below"—by militants on their side of the struggle. Kearns and MacCabe are uncomfortable not only looking up at Nelson, but also looking down at Dublin. For Parnell especially, power gains in Parliament invited criticism from the militant Irish nationalists (Lyons 1971, 175–176, 192). When he negotiated his release from prison in 1882 by agreeing to a cease-fire, a group of militants calling themselves the "invincibles" murdered the chief secretary Cavendish and undersecretary Burke in Phoenix Park (Lyons 1971, 176). As the murders reminded him, Parnell was not in control of the guerilla violence that, in the form of the land war, had given him his powerful negotiating position in Parliament. Like Kearns and MacCabe, Parnell, at the time of his imprisonment, was in an awkward position. It was the agrarian violence in Ireland that gave him his leverage in England, but only as long as the violence continued. At the same time, the longer the violence went on, the less likely were the English to believe Parnell was in control. The pillar on which Parnell sat was in danger of falling. At the end of the land war he was doubly powerless, as the English imprisoned him and the Irish guerilla campaign slipped out of his control. Like the women of Stephen's story, he could neither look up to the English nor look down to the Irish.

By naming Stephen's story *Deus nobis haec otia fecit*, MacHugh expresses both disappointment with the result of the last major push for Irish independence and hope that its gains would ultimately sow the seeds for greater success in the future. The allusion to the first *Eclogue* suggests that the story discusses the politics of land. So, in MacHugh's reading, the two women, Anne Kearns and Florence

MacCabe, are Tityrus and Meliboeus, and by extension they represent the leaders of the Land League, including especially Parnell. The women save their money to buy admission to Nelson's pillar, and their laborious climb to the top represents the Irish struggle for independence in general, and the land war in particular. The uncomfortable position in which Kearns and MacCabe find themselves at the top of the tower, unable to look up at Nelson or down at Dublin, allegorizes the position in which Parnell found himself at the end of the land war, unable to use his leverage in Parliament and unable to control the nationalist violence in Ireland. Finally, in an appropriately agrarian metaphor, the plum seeds Stephen's Irish-women scatter over the city are the seeds of more successful nationalist campaigns.

MacHugh is a professor of Latin and uses Latin literature to read Stephen's story, but earlier in "Aeolus" he associates the Roman Empire with the British Empire and expresses regret that he does not profess the purer, less vile, and less British Greek rather than Latin (*Ulysses* 7.560–570). And yet, O'Molloy argues for the benefits of Roman law as well as the harm of Roman imperialism (*Ulysses* 7.499–500), and in the process of promoting Greek and vilifying Latin, MacHugh praises Ireland's Catholic rather than British inheritance (*Ulysses* 7.555–556). MacHugh uses his experience with Virgil to make sense of the Irish nationalist struggle against the British Empire, just as Joyce uses classical literature and especially Virgil to do the same. Both recognize the attraction and necessity of using classical culture to make sense of modernity, but both also recognize that the reception of Rome has the potential to cut both ways.

In "Aeolus," then, Stephen is an author who denies the Roman influence and the Roman reading of his story. He prefers a Jewish or Christian framework for interpreting his work. MacHugh is an intellectual who wants to escape what he sees as the oppressive influence of Roman culture, but can only make sense of Stephen's story through the lens of Virgil. MacHugh's reading works both because he himself knows Virgil well and because Stephen cannot escape the classical tradition any more than MacHugh can. There is a generally Roman and specifically Virgilian presence in the story in spite of the efforts and intentions of both the author and the reader. They recognize that Virgil's poetic and political struggle with the land issue of Augustan Rome is a way of working through the literary and political issues of land in late colonial Ireland. They also, however, demonstrate the inescapability and insidious nature of the Roman presence in Ireland. The nationalist intellectuals of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in Ireland sought to construct a purely Irish nation, and in "Aeolus" the gathering at the newspaper office includes a discussion of a speech promoting the Irish language (*Ulysses* 7.790–883). The nationalists, however, make a parallel between the English language and Roman imperialism. Their effort to construct a pure Ireland

untouched by the Roman Empire does not and cannot escape their reception of Rome. This model of insidious reception is a way of reading *Ulysses* as well. The novel that proclaims itself to be Greek cannot escape the mediation of Rome. Joyce's "cloacal obsession" exposes and uses that presence of Rome in the emerging Irish national identity.

Semicolonial Virgil

At the beginning of *Semicolonial Joyce*, Derek Attridge and Marjorie Howes quote from the sixth chapter of *Finnegans Wake*, "Gentes and laitymen, fullstoppers and semicolonials, hybrids and lubberds!" (*Finnegans Wake* 152.16; quoted in Attridge and Howes 2000, 1). They take the confusion and multiplication of oppositions in this sentence as characteristic of life in a colony in the process of becoming independent, and rather than fixing Joyce's writing as colonial or postcolonial, they name it "semicolonial." Joyce's turn to Virgil in the semicolonial moment indicates that there is something semicolonial in Virgil as well. In my readings of the semicolonial Virgil, I do not contend that Joyce was a scholarly reader of Virgil whose work has somehow been overlooked, nor do I attempt to uncover statements of Joyce's opinion of Virgil. Rather, I uncover the semicolonial aspects of Virgil's poetry that Joyce uses to work through his own semicoloniality.

One of the most common aspects of anti-colonial and postcolonial nationalisms is the search for ancient roots (Hobsbawm 1990; Hobsbawm and Ranger 1992; Anderson 2006). Nationalists lay claim to an ancient tradition establishing a right to independence, and the Irish revivalists are an excellent example (Castle 2001). The ancient roots of Joyce's Ireland are less Gaelic than they are Roman, but the presence of Rome in Irish nationalism is not evidence of the Roman Empire's continuity with or direct influence upon the Irish nation. Joyce's Irish modernism constructs the Roman Empire as a classical culture that can be used in the process of building a postcolonial nation-state. As Ziolkowski demonstrates in *Virgil and the Moderns*, an excellent book that unfortunately but understandably omits Joyce's reception of Virgil, the modernists made Virgil into what he is for us (Ziolkowski 1993, 3–26). It is not, therefore, anachronistic to read Virgil's poetry as semicolonial. Virgil's poems are semicolonial because colonial and postcolonial authors like Joyce understood their own positions through Virgil. If Virgil was particularly important to the first half of the twentieth century in large part because of the sense that there was a crisis of history analogous to the crisis of Rome in the late republican and Augustan periods (Ziolkowski 1993; 6–12, 236–237), then

readings of the crisis of modernity were formed in part through the reception of Virgil. As James Porter has argued, classical antiquity is important for modernity as the ancient against which the modern defines itself: antiquity allows modernity to "misrecognize itself in its own image of the past" (Porter 2003, 64).

The presence of Virgil in Joyce is not a unidirectional line of influence, but rather an intertextual relationship that moves in both directions. By constructing modern Ireland in relation to ancient Rome through Virgilian poetry, Joyce also constructs a semicolonial Virgil. And indeed, not only does the first *Eclogue* discuss the politics of land, it also frames that discussion in terms of imperialism and collective, though perhaps not quite national, identity. Strangely (for a pair of rustic farmers and shepherds), Tityrus and Meliboeus's conversations touch upon such distant locations as Parthia, Germany, Africa, Scythia, the Oaxes, and Britain.¹¹ Tityrus brings up Parthia and Germany, using them to assert the natural association of identity and geography:

Ante leues ergo pascentur in aethere cerui
et freta destituent nudos in litore piscis,
ante pererratis amborum finibus exsul
aut Ararim Parthus bibet aut Germania Tigrim,
quam nostro illius labatur pectore uultus.

Eclogue 1.59–63

Nimble deer will graze in the sky and exposed fish on the shore will leave the sea, a Parthian exile will drink the Arar or Germany the Tigris, with the borders of both having been crossed, before that man's face would slip from our heart.

Tityrus takes the examples of a Parthian exile drinking from a river in Germany and of Germany itself drinking from a Parthian river as something as absurdly unnatural as deer on the ocean or fish on land. Parthians naturally, assumes Tityrus, belong in Parthia, and Germans in Germany. This natural association of geographical territory with cultural and political identity is a key element of colonialism and nationalism (Anderson 2006, 170–178). The Irish, for example, take their political identity from the assumption of a natural association with the territory of Ireland.

Meliboeus's response to Tityrus's assumption of territorial identity is to problematize his own identity as territorially displaced. While a historical farmer dispossessed by the triumviral confiscations might have remained nearby or moved to the city, Meliboeus envisions wandering to the ends of the earth and beyond:

At nos hinc alii sitientis ibimus Afros,
pars Scythiam et rapidum cretae uenimus Oaxen
et penitus toto diuisos orbe Britannos.
en umquam patrios longo post tempore finis
pauperis et tuguri congestum caespite culmen,
post aliquot, mea regna, uidens mirabor aristas?

Eclogue 1.64–69

But some of us will go to thirsty Africa, some to Scythia, and we will come to the swift, chalky¹² Oaxes and to the Britons, completely separated from the whole world. Alas, will I ever, a long time later, gaze upon my native borders, the roof, made of turf, of my poor cottage, seeing after some harvests my kingdom?

Once Tityrus has established the link between territory and identity, Meliboeus's vision of territorial dislocation involves a profound disturbance of his Italian and Roman identity. Meliboeus imagines his *patria* as a bounded space that he is about to leave behind for the boundless spaces of Africa, Scythia, the Oaxes, and Britain. A Roman soldier, who might feel at home in such faraway places, is like a foreigner in the Italy Meliboeus envisions:

impius haec tam culta noualia miles habebit,
barbarus has segetes. en quo discordia ciuis
prodixit miseros: his nos consequimur agros!

Eclogue 1.70–72

An impious soldier will have these well cared for grounds; a barbarian will have these fields. Alas, how discord has made wretched citizens: we have sown our fields for these men!

Although the soldier taking over Meliboeus's land is Roman, for the now dispossessed Meliboeus he is a *barbarus*, a foreigner. It is as though foreign Roman soldiers were colonizing Italy, calling into question the naturalized association of Rome and Italy politically embodied in Augustus's imminent policy of *tota Italia*. Tityrus has already noted the not just quantitative but also qualitative difference between Rome and the Italy he knows (*Eclogue 1.19–25*), and Meliboeus intensifies that difference by imagining discord turning Roman soldiers into foreign invaders.

Indeed, the Augustan identification of Rome and Italy was a new development, and the Social War between Rome and the Italian "allies" ended with the

granting of Roman citizenship to Italians in 88 BCE, just eighteen years before Virgil's birth.¹³ Virgil's parents remembered a time when Italy was defeated and incorporated into Rome. A part of the reason for Ireland's "semicolonial" status is that it was never a typical colony (Attridge and Howes 2000, 4–13). The proximity of Ireland to England, the old and longstanding occupation, and even the Act of Union of 1800 that made Ireland a part of the United Kingdom mean that it is sometimes difficult to fit Ireland with the standard images of colonial and post-colonial theories. Virgil's Italy is semicolonial in similar ways. The longstanding relationship between Rome and Italy and the ultimate incorporation of Italy into Rome itself in the Social War and the Augustan revolution make it easy to forget that Rome conquered Italy. Henrik Mouritsen (1998) has argued that the Social War was the last major Italian push for independence, and Jean-Michel David (1996) argues that the Roman conquest of Italy was not complete until the Augustan period. Virgil, as an Italian and a Roman, inhabits a semicolonial space and works through the semicolonial status of Italy in his poetry. As I will argue in particular in chapter 3 of this book, the uneasy integration of Rome and Italy is a major theme of the *Aeneid*. It is, however, already present in the first *Eclogue*.

The dislocations of geography and identity Meliboeus attributes to discord, alluding to civil war, make it difficult to draw a unified political significance from Virgil's poem, but they are entirely characteristic of the semicolonial condition. Emer Nolan, explaining Joyce's relationship to Irish nationalism, points out that "his writings about Ireland may not provide a coherent critique of either colonized or colonialist; but their very ambiguities and hesitations testify to the uncertain, divided consciousness of the colonial subject, which he is unable to articulate in its full complexity outside his fiction" (Nolan 1995, 130; quoted in Attridge and Howes 2000, 2). Nolan's analysis of Joyce might, *mutatis mutandis*, apply easily to Virgil. Political analyses of the first *Eclogue* emphasize the ambiguities, hesitations, and divided consciousness of the poem. Volk (2008, 2–5), in a survey of scholarship on the *Eclogues*, points out that readings of Virgil's poetry over the last fifty years have emphasized its ambiguity and complexity, and that ideological or political readings of the *Eclogues* have resisted any scholarly consensus. It is possible to read the poem as ultimately praising the young god in Rome, usually identified with Octavian, for saving Tityrus's farm, even if Tityrus himself does not give the divine youth credit for this. In fact, any implicit praise is somewhat tempered by the fact that Meliboeus does not escape eviction.¹⁴ In this reading, the dislocations the poem threatens yield to the ultimate grounding of Tityrus's identity in the Italian countryside. But it is also possible to emphasize the temporary nature of Tityrus's invitation, which ultimately fails to save Meliboeus from displacement by a barbarian Roman soldier.¹⁵ The Joycean perspective suggests that the ambiguities

and hesitations Virgil articulates in his poetry are not only due to the contradictions between praise for Octavian's benefits and discomfort with the violence that made them possible (although this is certainly an important problem for Virgil), but also due to the Augustan question of the semicolonial status of Italy vis-à-vis Rome.

The semicolonial Virgil is a Virgil that existed before Joyce's *Ulysses*, and it could be argued that this reading of Virgil, has little to do with Joyce. This Virgil is nevertheless one shaped by Joyce's literary reception. Not only does the modernist *Ulysses* construct the *Aeneid* as "classical," but by incorporating the classical into its construction of itself as "modernist," the novel both exposes the presence of the classical in the modernist and demonstrates the presence of the modernist in the classical. The resulting readings are not those of Virgil's contemporaries, nor are they readings we could attribute to Joyce. Rather, my readings of Virgil are those made possible through an analysis of Joyce reading Virgil.

Joyce's Citizen and Virgil's Cacus

In the last chapter, I analyzed an allusion in the “Aeolus” episode of *Ulysses* to Virgil’s first *Eclogue*, and I argued that the allusion reads the first *Eclogue* as an allegory of the politics of land in late colonial Ireland. In this chapter I turn to the *Aeneid* itself, analyzing an allusion in the “Cyclops” episode of *Ulysses* to *Aeneid* 8. The character of “the citizen” in the “Cyclops” episode draws on several models. The Odyssean structure of the novel aligns the citizen with Homer’s Polyphemus. The citizen is also, however, the Irish nationalist Michael Cusack, founder of the Gaelic Athletic Association (Gifford 1989, ad 12.58). The citizen further resembles the legendary heroes of Irish folklore popular among the nationalist proponents of the Irish Revival. My focus in this chapter is a fourth model for the citizen, namely a classical allusion that identifies the citizen with both the hero Hercules and the monster Cacus of Virgil’s *Aeneid* (Schork 1997, 132–136). In the *Aeneid*, the righteously enraged Hercules frees the pastoral community of Pallanteum from the monster Cacus, and then moves on, leaving the town in peace (*Aeneid* 8.184–279). As Hercules and Cacus, the nationalist citizen represents both a heroic liberator and an oppressive monster. Through Virgilian allusion, “Cyclops” demonstrates both the destructive and the liberating aspects of Irish nationalism.

Joyce’s allusion to the episode of Hercules and Cacus characterizes Irish nationalism as a hybrid movement. It is a well-established thesis of postcolonial studies that anti-colonial nationalism constructs the new nation in the image of the colonial power.¹ The Irish Free State, for example, designed its constitution in large part based on the English system (Lyons 1971, 465–479), and despite efforts to promote the Irish language modern Ireland primarily uses English. The result is a hybrid of dependence on and independence from colonial rule. “Cyclops,” and in particular the association of the citizen with Hercules and Cacus, plays out the hybridity of Irish nationalism at multiple levels. First, the citizen draws on multiple models, including both the hero Hercules and monster Cacus. Second, through these models, the citizen acts out multiple roles, including especially that of the liberating

hero (like Hercules) and the oppressive monster (like Cacus). Finally, the citizen represents hybridity by introducing a discordant element into his surroundings. He is out-of-place as a Roman classical allusion in an episode that parodies the Irish Revival, as a mythical figure in the real setting of a Dublin pub, and as a violent force embedded in a peaceful, civilian community. Though the Homeric label of the episode suggests that the nationalist citizen will embody a monocular view, the Virgilian allusion reveals a multiplicity of perspectives on citizenship in the emerging Irish nation.

The hybridity of the citizen is in keeping with his status as a monster as well as his anti-colonial nationalism. The monster, as Jeffrey Cohen argues, is “the harbinger of category crisis” (Cohen 1996, 6). Monsters refuse easy categorization and even threaten to destabilize established categories including gender, morality, and community. The monster is both an insider and an outsider, inhabiting a place that is completely outside the community, beyond the pale, as it were, and yet somehow inside the community as well (Cohen 1996, 20). In a colonial context, the monstrosity of the indigenous people is an excuse for conquest. In his 1188 *Topography of Ireland*, Giraldus Cambrensis, whom the citizen cites as part of his argument for ancient Irish contact with Greece and Rome (*Ulysses* 12.1251), encouraged English conquest by representing the Irish as monstrous (Cohen 1996, 10–11). Giraldus points to how their monstrosity threatens normal categories; for example, he notes that Irish men urinate sitting down and women do so standing (Giraldus Cambrensis 1982, 24; cited in Cohen 1996, 11). The citizen, as a monster, embodies the threat to categories that encourages the colonial subjection of the Irish.

“Cyclops” and the Politics of *Ulysses*

“Cyclops” is a particularly important episode for understanding the politics of *Ulysses*. The Gilbert schema identifies the “art” of the episode as “politics” and the “symbol” as “Fenian,” and the content of the episode bears this out. The citizen’s historical model is Michael Cusack, founder of the Gaelic Athletic Association in 1884. Joe Hynes describes the citizen: “There’s the man . . . that made the Gaelic sports revival. There he is sitting there” (*Ulysses* 12.880–881). Cusack and the GAA were not just revivalist, but also violently nationalist. F. S. L. Lyons explains:

When, on 1 November 1884, he founded the Gaelic Athletic Association at Thurles in county Tipperary at least four of the seven men who attended the meeting were Fenians. This connection between the GAA and the extreme wing of the nationalist movement was never lost. (Lyons 1971, 221)

The citizen's nationalist rhetoric and his link to Cusack associate him with the militantly nationalist aspect of the Irish Revival, and his central role in the episode makes it difficult to discuss "Cyclops" without referring to Irish politics.

At first the political stance of the episode seems to be a straightforward rejection of the revivalist nationalism the citizen embodies (Kenner 1955, 254–255). His rough treatment of the protagonist Bloom is not likely to endear the citizen to the reader, and his monstrous association with Polyphemus sets him up as the villain of the episode. David Lloyd argues that the portrayal of the citizen is negative, and the episode itself is a demonstration of an alternative vision of Irish national culture:

This chapter, that in *Ulysses* in which issues of nationalist politics and culture are played out most intensely and in which the various elements of Irish culture are most thoroughly deployed, circulates not only thematically but also stylistically around adulteration as the constitutive anxiety of nationalism. For while the citizen is militant against the hybridization of Irish culture, the chapter itself dramatizes adulteration as the condition of colonial Ireland at virtually every level. (Lloyd 1993, 106)

Lloyd looks beyond the episode's plot to consider the form of the narrative, where interpolations that parody various literary and technical nineteenth-century styles frequently interrupt the nameless narrator's commentary (Hayman 1974, 265–271, 274–275).² For Lloyd, the citizen represents a type of nationalism that seeks unity in purity, but the episode's adulterated form also dramatizes an alternative, hybridized Irish nationalism. The citizen and the traditional revivalist nationalism he represents seek to revive what is essentially Irish, and the Hungarian Jew Bloom has no place in such Irish purity. Ultimately, what Lloyd takes away from this episode is a criticism of the nationalist movement for its inability to tolerate Bloom's adulteration of their nation.

Emer Nolan, responding to Lloyd, argues that even within the supposedly monologic citizen, there is already adulteration. She writes:

So, although in "Cyclops," the drinkers consciously espouse nationalism, they are nonetheless clearly subaltern. The most obvious "practice" in which they engage is talking, but their speech, despite their aspiration towards an ideal discourse which would be specifically Irish, belongs to the realm of Babel, with Joyce's mixed and decentered styles. (Nolan 2000, 82)

By appealing to the stylistic variation in the speech of the citizen and his fellow nationalists, Nolan demonstrates that even within a single and supposedly purely Irish discourse there is plurality.

The readings of Lloyd and Nolan exemplify a recently dominant trend in Joyce scholarship: focusing on the relation of Joyce's fiction to the emerging Irish nation. This scholarship emphasizes what is modern in the texts. Nolan says of Bloom and the citizen that "They are both essentially modern" (Nolan 2000, 92). The modernity of Bloom and the citizen, however, appears through allusion to antiquity. It is my contention that Joyce's use of Virgil's Hercules and Cacus as models for the citizen hybridizes the character by associating him with a multiplicity of political roles. As Cacus and Hercules, the citizen is an oppressed rustic, a tyrannical monarch, a violent terrorist, and a heroic liberator. Unlike Lloyd, who views the citizen as a representative of purity, and unlike Nolan, who finds hybridity in the citizen through his speech, I argue that the very constitution of the nationalist character is hybridized through classical models. Through Virgilian allusion, the citizen becomes more than a straightforward satire of nationalist rhetoric; he embodies the complexity of citizenship in the Irish community.

Hercules, Cacus, and the Politics of the *Aeneid*

The story of the battle between Hercules and Cacus is a complex episode, and it is much discussed in scholarship on the *Aeneid*. A brief summary of the episode and the scholarly debate surrounding it will be useful. When Aeneas arrives at Pallanteum (the future site of Rome) to seek Arcadian allies in his battle against Turnus, he finds the people celebrating a festival in honor of Hercules. The Arcadian king Evander tells Aeneas the story of the origin of the festival, which Romans of Virgil's time celebrated. An evil, fire-breathing monster named Cacus, a son of Vulcan, had long been terrorizing the people of Pallanteum:

hic spelunca fuit vasto summota recessu,
semihominis Caci facies quam dira tenebat
solis inaccessam radiis; semperque recenti
caede tepebat humus, foribusque adfixa superbis
ora virum tristi pendebant pallida tabo.
huic monstro Vulcanus erat pater: illius atros
ore vomens ignis magna se mole ferebat.

Aeneid 8.193–199

There was a cave here, sunk in empty depth, unreachable by the rays of the sun, a cave in which the ominous figure of semi-human Cacus lived. The

ground was always warm with fresh slaughter, and faces of men, pale with gloomy putrescence, used to hang fixed to the arrogant doors. Vulcan was father to this monster—he used to bear himself with great bulk spewing that one's black fires from his mouth.

Evander continues, explaining that Hercules drove his cattle by the town and Cacus stole four bulls and four heifers. Hercules found him and choked him to death, thus saving the Arcadians from the monster and ensuring that for centuries the people would celebrate Hercules as a benevolent force of civilization.

Since Michael Putnam's influential analysis of *Aeneid* 8 (Putnam 1965, 105–150), the battle between Hercules and Cacus has been a central point of contention in the debate over the politics of the *Aeneid*. Karl Galinsky has demonstrated that the episode serves as a paradigm for heroic action (Galinsky 1966), and Philip Hardie argues that it serves a “nodal function” in the poem (Hardie 1986, 115). The primary question of the political debate has been whether or not the *Aeneid* supports Augustus. In his introduction to the poem, the ancient commentator Servius ascribes to Virgil two intentions for the *Aeneid*: “Homerum imitari et Augustum laudare parentibus” (“to imitate Homer and to praise Augustus, beginning with his ancestors”). Since antiquity, however, certain passages and aspects of the *Aeneid* have forced critics to defend its pro-Augustan stance, and in the 1960s Putnam and the so-called Harvard school (or pessimistic school) of Virgilian scholarship argued that the poem undercuts its own praise of the *princeps* (e.g., Parry 1963; Clausen 1964; Putnam 1965). This provoked a reaction from the so-called optimists, who argued that it is anachronistic to suggest that Virgil's poem is anything but pro-Augustan (e.g., Galinsky 1966; Cairns 1989). For some time now it has been unfashionable to frame the question of the politics of the poem in terms of its support for Augustus or lack thereof, but it is still important to acknowledge the influence of the Harvard school in any political reading of the *Aeneid*.

Putnam, like the more pro-Augustan reader Galinsky,³ begins his reading of Hercules and Cacus by noting that Hercules is a heroic model for Aeneas, and in turn for Augustus: “The Cacus episode offers Aeneas the chance to follow the example of Hercules and rid Italy of unwanted despots. Mezentius will be one of the first to follow in Cacus' footsteps and will suffer accordingly” (Putnam 1965, 132). Hercules is a hero model for Aeneas to follow. Moreover, Putnam writes:

The legend of Hercules and the cattle thief is much more than simply another incident in the past to help inform Aeneas' conception of his new role. It is a spiritual inheritance with implications which extend, in terms which border even on allegory, far beyond Evander and even Aeneas himself. (Putnam 1965, 134)

The *Aeneid* presents an arc of Italian heroes beginning with Hercules, who defeats Cacus and liberates Pallanteum, which will become Rome, continuing through Aeneas, who defeats Turnus, and culminating in Augustus, who on the shield of Aeneas described at the end of book 8 defeats Antony and establishes a new golden age. Aeneas and Augustus follow Hercules in defeating the enemies of Rome. Evander emphasizes the potential connection between Hercules and Aeneas:

‘Haec,’ inquit, ‘limina victor
Alcides subiit, haec illum regia cepit.
aude, hospes, contemnere opes et te quoque dignum
finge deo, rebusque veni non asper egenis.’

Aeneid 8.362–365

“This threshold,” he said, “the victor Hercules crossed, this kingdom received him. Dare, guest, to spurn riches and fashion yourself also worthy to be a god, do not scorn poor things.”

And as Putnam points out, “By imitating this same gesture Aeneas acknowledges acceptance of Rome, and in particular of Hercules’ part in its foundation” (Putnam 1965, 135). So far, the episode is very patriotic.

Putnam, however, also notes that just before the Cacus episode, Virgil contrasts the Augustan Capitol with Evander’s pastoral Arcadian town, “Aurea nunc, olim silvestribus horrida dumis” (“golden now, once bristling with woods and thickets”; *Aeneid* 8.348; quoted in Putnam 1965, 135). Augustan Rome, it seems, has not followed Evander’s advice to spurn riches in order to become godlike. Moreover, the semi-divine Hercules himself does not fit Evander’s heroic model. He may have rid Arcadia of a public enemy, but he did not do it out of generosity or humble heroism, but rather out of anger at Cacus for stealing his cattle. Hercules obtained these cattle violently in the first place, as spoils of his defeat of the monster Geryon. When he rips the top from Cacus’s mountain home, hurls trees and rocks, and finally strangles the monster over stolen cattle, it is not his civilizing skills that we see, but his powerful rage. Putnam explains, “But even Hercules is for the moment said to blaze with madness (*furiis*, *Aeneid* 8.219; *furens*, *Aeneid* 8.228). His is not to absorb and reapply the pastoral humility of Evander” (Putnam 1965, 134). Though Hercules is ultimately a hero, his heroic deeds contain a madness and violence that mirror those of Cacus. Since Hercules is a model for Aeneas and Augustus, his rage reflects badly on Aeneas’s killing of Turnus and on Augustus’s war with Antony. The rage of Hercules is a germ of anti-imperial sentiment in Virgil’s epic.

The debate over the politics of *Aeneid* 8 shows that one can read Hercules's heroic rage in two ways. On the one hand, Hercules defeats monsters, and in the case of Cacus, he defeats a monster that was oppressing a peaceful, pastoral community. On the other hand, in order to defeat the monsters, Hercules uses a violence that escapes his control. *Furor*, in the *Aeneid*, is an evil force to be defeated. In book 1, Jupiter closes his famous prophecy of the golden age of Augustus by imprisoning *furor*:

Furor impius intus
saeva sedens super arma et centum vinctus aënis
post tergum nodis fremet horridus ore cruento.

Aeneid 1.294–296

Unholy Rage, sitting inside [the temple of Janus] on savage arms and bound
with a hundred bronze knots behind its back, will rave, bristling, with a
bloody mouth.

The proper governing of the empire in the new golden age of Augustus requires the containment of rage. Hercules shows that the establishment of that peaceful government is not possible without the rage that liberates the community from the oppressor. However heroic he is, Hercules cannot stay and govern Pallanteum. His violence may be a necessary evil, but it is evil nonetheless.

Hercules and Cacus in “Cyclops”

R. J. Schork has noted the extensive parallels between the conflict of “Cyclops” and the battle between Hercules and Cacus in *Aeneid* 8 (Schork 1997, 132–136). The allusion begins when the citizen reacts with an unusual oath to the news that a Dublin mayoral candidate has been meeting with the Irish Cattle Traders: “Hairy Iopas, says the citizen, that exploded volcano, the darling of all countries and the idol of his own” (*Ulysses* 12.829–830). “Hairy Iopas,” is a translation of Virgil’s *crinitus Iopas* (*Aeneid* 1.740), who is a bard in Dido’s court. With the *Aeneid* in mind, Schork proceeds to explain the phrase “exploded volcano.” He argues that “exploded volcano” modifies not hairy Iopas, but the citizen himself, since the description fits both the citizen’s fiery personality and the fiery socket that is left of Polyphemus’s eye after Odysseus blinds him in *Odyssey* 9 (Schork 1997, 135). However, as Schork goes on to suggest, the description also fits the fire-breathing son of Vulcan, Cacus, especially since Hercules rips off the top

of his mountain home in the process of killing him. Virgil verbally associates Cacus with a volcano three times in book 8. According to the Latin expression, volcanoes “vomit flames” (“*ignem vomunt*”), and so too does Cacus. Evander describes him during his battle with Hercules as “*incendia vana vomentem*” (“vomiting futile fires”; *Aeneid* 8.259), “*atros / ore vomens ignis*” (“vomiting black fire from his mouth”; *Aeneid* 8.198–99), and “*faucibus ingentem fumum . . . / evomit*” (“he vomits huge smoke from his maw”; *Aeneid* 8.252–253). The mention of Iopas brings the *Aeneid* into play, the Irish Cattle Traders point to Cacus’s theft of Hercules’s cattle, and the exploded volcano epithet associates the citizen with Vulcan’s son Cacus.

Furthermore, Joyce’s description of the citizen (*Ulysses* 12.151–205) so closely matches Virgil’s description of Cacus (*Aeneid* 8.184–279) that Schork asserts, “Joyce had his eye directly on Virgil’s text when composing this section of ‘Cyclops’” (Schork 1997, 135). In particular, Schork points out the following parallels:

From shoulder to shoulder he measured several ells . . . [a body] covered . . . with a strong growth of tawny prickly hair (*Ulysses* 12.155–157):

Villosaque saetis / pectora (*Aeneid* 8.266–267) (a chest shaggy with bristles)

A powerful current of warm breath issued at regular intervals from the profound cavity of his mouth (*Ulysses* 12.163–164):

Faucibus ingentem fumum (mirabile dictu) / *evomit* (*Aeneid* 8.252–253) (he spews forth a mass of smoke from his jaws—an incredible sight); *illius atros / ore vomens ignis* (*Aeneid* 8.198–199) (spewing forth dark fires from his mouth).

From his girdle hung a row of seastones . . . on these were graven . . . the tribal images of many Irish heroes and heroines of antiquity [here follow the names of ninety such stalwarts] (*Ulysses* 12.173–199):

Foribusque adfixa superbis / ora virum tristi pendebant pallida tabo (*Aeneid* 8.196–197) (attached to the mighty doors [of Cacus’s cave] were hanging the heads of heroes, faces ghostly pale with gore). (Schork 1997, 135–135)⁴

These verbal parallels show that Cacus is a model for the citizen. It is notable that the three parallels Schork cites are included in one of the parodic interpolations rather than the main narrative of the episode, but this fact does not invalidate

them as descriptions of the citizen. The inclusion of the monstrous characteristics of the citizen in an interpolation does separate them from the perception of the bar-patron narrator, who either does not notice or chooses not to remark on the monstrosity of his companion, but despite their absence from the narrator's account they are present in the text of the episode.

A further verbal clue that has escaped Schork's notice strengthens the association of Cacus with the citizen. When Bloom leaves Kiernan's pub at the end of the episode, the citizen throws an empty biscuit tin after him (*Ulysses* 12.1853–1857), and an interpolation describes the seismic impact of the tin on the street and its aftermath (*Ulysses* 12.1858–1896). The crown prince of England takes command of the cleanup effort (*Ulysses* 12.1892).⁵ Here the prince is named "Hercules Hannibal Habeas Corpus Anderson" (*Ulysses* 12.1893). Joyce positions Hercules, Cacus's opponent, as a member of the English royalty, an adversary of Irish nationalism. While the English royalty of the twentieth century had little to do with actual policy decisions about colonial Ireland, the monarchy was still a powerful symbol of the British Empire, and the nationalist citizen seeking a republican government naturally presents the monarchy as the enemy. Given that specific verbal clues have already linked the citizen with Cacus, associating Hercules with the English monarchy strengthens the connection between the enemy of Hercules (Cacus) and the enemy of the monarchy (the citizen).

"Cyclops" not only links the citizen to the monster Cacus, but also subtly aligns the citizen with the hero Hercules. The link between the citizen and Hercules begins with the near homophones "Geryon" and "Garryowen" (Schork 1997, 134). Hercules kills Cacus for stealing the cattle he won from Geryon. Virgil writes:

Nam maximus ultor
tergemini nece Geryonae spoliisque superbus
Alcides aderat

Aeneid 8.201–203

For the greatest avenger, Hercules, was there, proud of the killing of triple-body Geryon and of the spoils.

Hercules defeats Geryon, and the citizen owns a dog named Garryowen. Joyce writes, "So we turned into Barney Kiernan's and there, sure enough, was the citizen up in the corner having a great confab with himself and that bloody mangy mongrel, Garryowen" (*Ulysses* 12.118–120). Then, right after Hynes orders three pints (perhaps evoking "triple-body" Geryon), the citizen grabs Garryowen "and, by Jesus, he near throttled him" (*Ulysses* 12.150). Hercules kills Cacus by throttling

him: "corripit in nodum complexus, et angit inhaerens / elisos oculos et siccum sanguine guttur" ("having knotted his arms around him he held him and he throttled him so that his eyes popped out and his throat was dried of blood"; *Aeneid* 8.260–261). While Hercules strangles Cacus, the citizen throttles his dog. Both this citizen and Hercules have dealings with Geryon/Garryowen, and both of them are stranglers. In an early draft of "Cyclops," Joyce even had "Cusack" threaten to strangle "the last king" (Grodén 1975, 151). The name Garryowen and the citizen's propensity for throttling associate the citizen not with Cacus but with Hercules.

Specific verbal allusions in "Cyclops" associate the citizen with both the hero Hercules and the monster Cacus. This is a crucial insight for understanding the politics of the episode, as the allusion characterizes Irish nationalism as both monstrous and heroic. Nevertheless, the allusion has not interested scholars of nationalism in Joyce's fiction, as their focus is primarily on modern Irish culture. On the other hand, while Schork's work is very valuable, it is not his aim to analyze the significance of the allusions he describes. By combining these two usually distinct approaches to "Cyclops," however, a reader gains a deeper insight into the significance of the classical allusion and a fuller understanding of the complex politics of the episode.

Heroic Rage

The most important political implication of the allusion to Hercules and Cacus in "Cyclops" is that the citizen is both the monstrous villain Cacus and the liberating hero Hercules. This means that the citizen, and the violent, revivalist nationalism he represents, is not wholly good or evil, but a combination of the two. The doubling of the citizen as villain and hero means that violent Irish nationalism is mostly monstrous but also heroic and liberating. The image of the citizen as liberator is strengthened by Virgil's presentation of Cacus as a king. The *Aeneid* calls Cacus's cave a "regia" ("royal palace"; *Aeneid* 8.242). This name has caused problems for commentators since antiquity. Donatus explains, "quia ibi tyrannidem agitare" ("since he ruled a tyranny there"), and Servius suggests "sicut Cacus putabat" ("so Cacus thought"). The need for explanations testifies to the oddity of the attribution of a royal palace to such a monster, especially since kingship is an important theme in the *Aeneid* (Cairns 1989, 1–84). The poem insistently refers to the principal characters of the poem as royalty. In book I alone, Jupiter is *rex* (*Aeneid* 1.65, 241), Juno is *regina* (*Aeneid* 1.9, 46, 76), Aeolus is *rex* (*Aeneid* 1.52, 62, 137), Ascanius is *regius* (*Aeneid* 1.677), Aeneas is *rex* (*Aeneid* 1.38, 544, 553, 575), and Dido is *regina* eleven times (*Aeneid* 1.303, 389, 454, 496, 522, 594, 660, 674,

697, 717, 728) (Cairns 1989, 1–2). The status of important characters is often determined by how well they fulfill the role of the monarch. Aeneas, Jupiter, and Evander are examples of good kings, while Dido, Juno, and Mezentius are example of bad queens and kings.⁶ In light of the thematic importance of kingship in the *Aeneid*, the striking attribution of a kingdom to Cacus is significant. Cacus is not just an evil monster, he fills the thematic role of the bad king. The hero Hercules is not just killing a monster, but deposing a tyrant.

The issue of kingship in the *Aeneid* is complicated by the fact that Augustus was insistent that he was not establishing a monarchy, but restoring the republican government of Rome. It is odd that the *Aeneid* consistently refers to Augustus's ancestor and model Aeneas as a king. It would seem that Virgil is setting up for Augustus a divine and inherited right of kingship in spite of Augustus's own claims to the contrary. Consistent with the ambivalent politics of the poem, the insinuation that Augustus is the inheritor of a monarchy exposes a key contradiction in Augustan rhetoric in the process of legitimizing the regime. Augustus was a monarch who called himself a citizen. When Virgil describes the battle of Actium on the shield of Aeneas at the end of book 8, he emphasizes the monarchy of Cleopatra, twice calling her *regina* (*Aeneid* 8.696, 707). This Augustus is a republican who defeats the monarch. The theme of tyrannicide, however, is a sensitive one for Augustus. The murderers of his adoptive father Caesar the dictator called themselves tyrannicides, but Augustus was proud of his vengeance on them. Augustus was adamant about his republicanism, but the reality of his own unofficial monarchy and his support of the dictator-for-life Caesar undercut his assertions. The *Aeneid* uses the theme of kingship to explore the contradiction. While the heroes of the poem are kings, in their most heroic moments they are freedom fighters who destroy tyrants. In the Hercules and Cacus story, the poem provides a heroic model of the overthrow of a monarch. By attributing a kingdom to Cacus, the *Aeneid* sets him up as a paradigm of tyranny that must be defeated. As Hercules defeats the tyrant Cacus, Aeneas defeats the tyrant Mezentius, and Augustus defeats queen Cleopatra.

In "Cyclops," Cacus as the oppressive foreign tyrant fills the role of the British colonizer. When the citizen is Hercules, he liberates the Irish from the oppressive king. However, the citizen is also Cacus. In the *Aeneid* those who claim to overthrow monarchy are monarchs themselves, in deed if not in name. In *Ulysses*, the one who calls himself citizen and seeks to set up a republican Free State carries covert traces of monarchy himself. The tyranny of the citizen is his oppressive agenda of Irish purity. Though the citizen's aim is to liberate the colony from the British, in his own way he colonizes the Irish. British imperialism and Irish revivalist nationalism share an emphasis on identifying and unifying the essence of

Irishness (Gibson 2002, 102–226). The citizen's desire for a pure Irish identity is a mirror of British colonization, which also identifies the characteristics of a homogeneous Irishness. Among the parallels between the citizen and Cacus are hanging heads, but where Cacus hangs the gory heads of his victims, the citizen hangs the glorious images of "many Irish heroes and heroines of antiquity" (*Ulysses* 12.176). The revivalist history of the citizen makes trophies out of those he would venerate. In the citizen, the liberating power of Hercules and the oppression of Cacus are two sides of the same coin.

Even when the citizen is like Hercules, however, there are complications that make his liberating power less than heroic. In the *Aeneid*, Hercules is a great hero, but his heroism stems from the same violent *furor* that the Augustan project seeks to contain. Moreover, when "Cyclops" aligns the citizen with Hercules, it does so by alluding to moments when Hercules is not merely heroic, but violently so. When the citizen throttles Garryowen, the dog's name points to Hercules's killing of Geryon while the method points to his killing of Cacus. Joyce's connection between the citizen and Hercules emphasizes the violent rage they have in common. Such heroic rage is deeply ambivalent: it allows heroes to defeat monsters but at the same time threatens to spin out of control, harming the very people it is supposed to liberate.

Like Hercules, the citizen is the type of hero who uses rage to defeat the enemy but also directs his fury against his own allies. Whereas Hercules kills the monstrous Geryon and throttles the monster Cacus, the citizen turns on his own dog. In the passage relating this event, the citizen's apparent show of affection toward Garryowen suddenly turns violent: "What Garry? Are we going to win? Eh? And with that he took the bloody old towser by the scruff of the neck and, by Jesus, he near throttled him" (*Ulysses* 12.148–150). This ambivalent behavior might be in keeping with the citizen's gruff demeanor and large size, but it also alludes to Hercules killing evil monsters. The rage that enables Hercules to defeat monsters is uncontrollable. (In other stories, Hercules cannot contain his mad violence and kills his wife, Megara, and their children.) For the citizen, as for Hercules, the madness and rage that make him heroic also lead him to turn against his own. In the context of the War of Independence, the citizen's violence might be more easily justified, but it does not belong in the civilian pub. One of the difficult tasks facing the postcolonial state is the suppression of the violence that achieved independence. In a civilian setting, the violent citizen makes victims of his own people.

Pastoral Monsters

To the extent that *Ulysses* aligns him with Hercules, the citizen is a problematic hero, but "Cyclops" more closely associates him with the monster

Cacus. Cacus, too, is a complex figure. He is caught up in his own web of intertextual relations, and the intertexts of Cacus are important to the meaning of the Cacus allusion in "Cyclops." Virgil's Cacus combines two major sources. First, the figure of Cacus appears in other ancient authors, including especially Livy (1.7.4–14); and second, Virgil's Cacus draws on the character of Polyphemus (Münzer 1911, 31; Putnam 1965, 131; Galinsky 1966, 31n32; Hardie 1986, 115–116). Specific verbal allusions in "Cyclops" point to Cacus, and because Cacus draws on Polyphemus, the episode associates the citizen with Polyphemus through Cacus. The Cacus allusion in "Cyclops" draws much of its complexity from the rich intertextuality of Virgil's Cacus. "Cyclops" not only aligns the citizen with Cacus, but also uses Virgil's text as a focal point for a network of ancient intertextuality that includes Polyphemus. The intertextual web surrounding Cacus and Polyphemus will show that the citizen is not entirely villainous, even when he is at his most monstrous. Just as Hercules adulterates heroism with problematic rage, Cacus tempers monstrous oppression with pastoral peace.

Polyphemus is an important model for both Joyce's citizen and Virgil's Cacus. Homer, however, is not Joyce's only ancient source for Polyphemus. H. D. Rankin and Murray Gross, for example, have shown that Euripides's satyr play *Cyclops* is a significant source for Joyce's "Cyclops" (Rankin 1973; Gross 2002). More important for the present discussion is Theocritus's story of Polyphemus in *Idyll* 11, in which Polyphemus sings of his love for the nymph Galatea. Theocritus turns Homer's monster into a pastoral singer. Ovid, following Theocritus, also casts Polyphemus as a pastoral singer in *Metamorphoses* 13. While the Cyclops always contains traces of the Homeric monster, the Theocritean and Ovidian traditions make him into a more sympathetic character. Taking into account not only Homeric epic but also the broader classical tradition makes Polyphemus a hybrid of a terrible monster and a sympathetic shepherd.

Joyce's "Cyclops" relies on the pastoral Polyphemus as well as the Homeric monster. Fritz Senn has demonstrated that the "Cyclops" episode depends heavily on Ovid's Polyphemus story (Senn 1989b).⁷ The most direct evidence for the connection is the presence of Galatea, for whom Ovid's pastoral Cyclops pines, as a character in the Linati schema.⁸ Although her name does not appear in the final text of "Cyclops," Senn argues that her presence in the schema indicates that she is conceptually present beneath the surface of the narrative.⁹ Once he has Galatea in mind, Senn is able to associate "Cyclops" with Ovid's *Metamorphoses* rather than Homer's *Odyssey*. He notes especially that, though there are many catalogues in Joyce's "Cyclops," there are none in the Polyphemus story of *Odyssey* 9 (Senn 1989b, 562). There are, however, quite a few catalogues in Ovid's Polyphemus story (Senn 1989b, 567). The catalogues of "Cyclops" are therefore Ovidian rather than Homeric. Furthermore, Senn points out that Ovid exaggerates and inflates the

material he takes from his major source, Theocritus, and argues that Joyce exaggerates the attributes of the citizen in a similar manner.¹⁰ Finally, Senn argues that both Ovid's Polyphemus episode and Joyce's "Cyclops" focus on livestock, citing as a specific parallel Ovid's, "ut vix circumeant distentum cruribus uber" ("How they can hardly walk for their distended udders"; *Metamorphoses* 13.826) and Joyce's, "their udders distended with superabundance of milk and butts of butter and rennets of cheese" (*Ulysses* 12.114).¹¹ Senn argues that "Cyclops" draws not just on Homer's Polyphemus, but also on the broader tradition of Polyphemus in Greek and Roman literature, and especially on the pastoral elements in Ovid.

While the Homeric Polyphemus is a monstrous villain, the later Polyphemus tradition softens his image with comical and sympathetic elements. The result is a hybrid of epic, pastoral, and even elegiac poetry. In Homer, the Cyclops is a man-eating monster who causes Odysseus's subsequent troubles by bringing down the wrath of Poseidon. He is a shepherd, but his occupation is incidental. Theocritus takes the monster and recasts him as a pastoral singer. The *Idylls* of Theocritus establish a new genre, dependent in many ways on epic, and Polyphemus serves as a point of generic departure. By removing the Cyclops from his epic context and rewriting him as a Sicilian shepherd-singer, Theocritus works out the distinctions and relations between epic and the new pastoral poetry (Halperin 1983). Even in the *Odyssey* Polyphemus is a shepherd, but in Theocritus he is comically incongruous in the role of the pastoral hero (Kurz 1982, 135–40; cited in Farrell 1992, 242). The incongruity of an epic monster in the role of a pastoral hero helps to establish and define Theocritus's new genre, the pastoral.

Ovid, in a version of the Polyphemus story that depends heavily on that of Theocritus, exploits and expands the generic hybridity of the character by adding the role of the elegiac lover (Farrell 1992, 240). Ovid's Polyphemus draws on multiple models and plays multiple roles. While his love song for Galatea is Theocritean, Ovid adds a rival for Galatea's affection, Acis, based on Virgil's adaptation of *Idyll* 11 in *Eclogue* 2 (Farrell 1992, 244n26), and his description of Polyphemus alludes to those of Homer in *Odyssey* 9 and Virgil's Polyphemus in *Aeneid* 3 (Farrell 1992, 247–248). In *Metamorphoses* 13, Polyphemus is the epic monster, the pastoral singer, and the elegiac lover. While scholars have often seen this as a comic exaggeration and parody of the pastoral genre (Solodow 1988, 22), Joseph Farrell argues that Ovid's Polyphemus does not belong to any one genre, nor does he create a new genre of his own (Farrell 1992, 266–267). Instead, Polyphemus is a figure of hybridity itself, mixing models, roles, genres, and intertexts. Theocritus hybridizes Polyphemus by recasting the epic monster as a pastoral hero, and Ovid makes the hybridized Cyclops into an embodiment of pure hybridity.

Joyce's parallel between Polyphemus and the citizen uses the hybridity of Polyphemus to hybridize the citizen. Not only does the citizen draw on many

models, but even within the single correspondence between the citizen and Polyphemus the complexity of the classical model already fragments and multiplies the roles of Joyce's character. "Cyclops" draws on the Theocritean/Ovidian Polyphemus, as the mention of Galatea in the schema shows, and the episode's catalogues and exaggerations as well as the mention of distended udders point specifically to Ovid. Joyce's use of Ovid's Polyphemus foregrounds the adulteration at the core of the character of the citizen. Not only does the episode's form fragment and adulterate the narrative, but adulteration and hybridization are primary features of the title character.

Of particular importance for "Cyclops" are the roles of the gigantic epic monster and the simple pastoral singer. These two positions stand out in "Cyclops" because the gigantic and the agrarian are both major themes of the Irish Revival that the citizen espouses. On the one hand, the Revival emphasizes the gigantic proportions of the heroic warriors of Irish legend. Standish O'Grady, for example, explains that legends of "the gigantic conception of heroism and strength, with which the forefront of Irish history is thronged, prove the great future of this race and land" (O'Grady 1881, 57; quoted in Gibson 2002, 108). On the other hand, the Revival's focus on finding Irish identity in the uncorrupted rural peasantry evokes pastoral themes. Edward Hirsch explains, "By mystifying an ancient, unchanging folk life, removed from the harsh realities of land agitation and social conflict in the countryside, they could treat the peasant as a romantic emblem of a deep, cultural, pastoral, and significantly anticommmercial . . . Irish life" (Hirsch 1991, 1122; cited in Castle 2001, 52). In an even more explicit reference to classical pastoral poetry, Yeats compares the Ireland of the revivalists to Arcadia (Yeats 1986, 6–7; cited in Castle 2001, 53). The citizen, whom "Cyclops" associates with both the epic and the pastoral Polyphemus, espouses a philosophy dominated by themes of classical epic and pastoral poetry.

Though "Cyclops" clearly associates the citizen with Polyphemus, the initial description of the character points not only to Polyphemus, but also to Cacus. Cacus too, in his own ways, combines the epic and the pastoral. The first way in which the epic and the pastoral meet in Cacus is through his narrative context. The story of Cacus is a part of the meeting between Aeneas and Evander, the former a Trojan refugee and the latter an Arcadian colonist. It takes place at the meeting of Troy and Arcadia (Putnam 1965, 134). Though Cacus himself is an epic monster, it is the pastoral king Evander who tells his story. As a legend of Evander's people, Cacus belongs to Arcadia. The narrative context of the Cacus episode draws the character into a pastoral setting.

The second way in which Cacus combines the epic and the pastoral is through other versions of the Cacus story. Although in Virgil Cacus is an evil monster, in earlier evidence Cacus is a pastoral singer and shepherd (Small 1982). The earliest

evidence of Cacus is a late fourth-century Etruscan mirror depicting a singer labeled "Cacu." The figure below Cacu holding the diptych is labeled "Artile," and the labels on the rim of the mirror name the two soldiers as "Caile Vipinas" and "Aule Vipinas." An unlabeled satyr overlooks the scene. Small (1982) reads this mirror as a scene of prophecy. The seer Cacu is singing a prophecy, which Artile records. The two warriors Caile and Aule Vipinas are about to ambush and capture Cacu in order to demand a prophecy. The trope of capturing a prophet can also be found in Ovid's *Fasti* 3 as Numa ambushes Picus and Faunus, in *Odyssey* 4 as Odysseus ambushes Proteus, and also in Virgil's *Georgics* 4 when Aristaeus ambushes Proteus. The most important thing to note here about the mirror is that Cacus is in no way monstrous, but is instead a singer.

The figure in the center of the mirror is unrecognizable as the monster of *Aeneid* 8, but the identification of the two characters is apparent in a passage from the second-century CE geographer Solinus, who cites the second-century BCE annalist Gnaeus Gellius on Cacus:

Ambiguitatum quaestiones excitavit, quod quaedam ibi multo ante Romulum culta sint. quippe aram Hercules, quam voverat, si amissas boves repperisset, punito Caco patri Inventori dicavit. qui Cacus habitavit locum, cui Salinae nomen est: ubi Trigemina nunc porta. hic, ut Gellius tradidit, cum a Tarchone Tyrrheno, ad quem legatus venerat missu Marsyae regis, socio Megale Phryge, custodiae foret datus, frustratus vincula et unde venerat redux, praesidiis amplioribus occupato circa Vulturnum et Campaniam regno, dum adtrectare etiam ea audet, quae concesserat in Arcadum iura, duce Hercule qui tunc forte aderat oppressus est. Megalen Sabini receperunt, disciplinam augurandi ab eo docti. suo quoque numini idem Hercules instituit aram, quae maxima apud pontifices habetur, cum se ex Nicostrate, Euandri matre, quae a vaticinio Carmentis dicta est, inmortalem conperisset. (Solinus 1.7–10; quoted in Small 1982, 5)

Ambiguity raised questions, because certain things were worshipped there much before Romulus. To be sure the altar, which Hercules had vowed if he found the lost cows, he dedicated to Pater Inventor after Cacus had been punished. This Cacus inhabited the place, which is called Salinae where the Porta Trigemina now stands. He, as Gellius recorded, with Megales the Phrygian as a companion, was sent as an envoy by Marsyas the king to Tarchon the Tyrrhenian, who put him in custody. He broke his bonds and went back home. Returning with greater forces, he seized the area around Vulturnus and Campania. When he dared to appropriate even those places

which the laws had granted to the Arcadian, he was killed by Hercules who happened to be present. The Sabines received Megales who taught them the art of augury. Hercules himself also set up an altar to his own divinity that is held to be the greatest among pontifices, since he had learned from Nicostrata, the mother of Evander, who was told by the prophesying of Carmenta, that he would be immortal. (Trans. Small 1982, 5)

This account is not as clear as one might hope, but it contains elements of both the Etruscan Cacū and the Roman Cacus. First, like the Etruscan Cacū, Cacus is human here rather than monstrous. Second, he is an emissary of Marsyas, who is a famous musician himself. Third, Cacus is captured, and although here he is not captured by the Vibennae, the capture still parallels the mirror. On the other hand, like the monster of *Aeneid* 8, Cacus in Gellius and Solinus appropriates something that does not belong to him. He is also the enemy of the Arcadian Evander, and Hercules kills him. So Gellius, in the second century BCE, identifies the Etruscan singer Cacū with the Roman monster Cacus. Either the legend is evolving, or Gellius is attempting to reconcile two figures. Either way, the singer Cacū is moving toward the Roman Cacus.

Gellius is not the only source showing the evolution of Cacū and Cacus. Even in the Augustan period, accounts other than that of Virgil engage with the pastoral, albeit criminal, singer Cacus rather than the Virgilian monster. In Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Cacus is a *lestes*, a robber (or pirate). Hercules suspects him of the cattle rustling, but has no proof, thanks to the trick of leading the cattle backward by their tails. When Hercules tries to enter the cave and search it, Cacus denies everything and calls out to his neighbors that a stranger is attacking him (1.39). In Livy, Cacus is more shepherd than monster as well, and although Joyce may not have known all of these alternative versions of Cacus, he was definitely familiar with this one from the first book of Livy.¹² Livy describes him as, “pastor accola eius loci, nomine Cacus, ferox uiribus, captus pulchritudine boum” (“a shepherd who lived near the place, by name Cacus, fierce with strength, taken by the beauty of the cattle”; 1.7.5). When Hercules clubs Cacus to death for stealing the cattle, the other shepherds accuse Hercules of murder, but Evander recognizes Hercules as a great hero and decrees that the people must worship him, whereupon Hercules builds an altar for that purpose (1.7.6–15). In Livy’s story, Cacus does steal the cattle, but he is hardly the monstrous killer of Virgil’s *Aeneid*. Whereas in the *Aeneid* Cacus terrorizes a pastoral town, in Livy Cacus is a representative of that uncivilized pastoral community, and the neighboring shepherds are outraged at what they call murder. It is only the intervention of the king that turns Hercules from a murderer into a hero. In this story Cacus is a bold shepherd and cattle rustler who sets the

stage for the state's imposition of civilized law and order. Livy's Cacus is a shepherd, albeit a criminal one.

Joyce, reading Livy's Cacus, may very well see the criminal shepherd as a sort of revivalist hero. The rustic criminal is a familiar figure in the Revival, especially in the plays of John Synge (Castle 2001, 149–171). Synge's plays valorize as heroes the lawless men of the rural west of Ireland. Luke Gibbons explains, "Synge's preoccupation with lawlessness and violence is central to his overall conception of the western world, for in throwing off the shackles of discipline and constraint, he is undermining . . . the centralization of law, ideology and the state apparatus" (Gibbons 1996, 33, cited in Castle 2001, 150). For Synge, the lawless, agrarian communities of the west represent a heroic Irish resistance to the civilization of the British Empire. The valorization of agrarian criminals was not a universal feature of the Revival, and in fact Synge's most famous example of such a hero, namely Christy Mahon of *The Playboy of the Western World*, provoked a riot among the Irish nationalists at its performance at the Abbey Theater in 1907 (Lyons 1971, 241). Nevertheless, Synge had the support of Yeats, and in spite of Joyce's disapproval of Synge's early play *Riders to the Sea*, and in spite of his initial joy at Yeats's embarrassment over the riot, *The Playboy of the Western World* earned Synge Joyce's support as well (Ellmann 1959, 129, 248, 276). Seen through the lens of Synge's criminal heroes, Livy's bold, cattle-rustling Cacus is a sympathetic shepherd unjustly murdered by the raging Hercules.

So far, I have shown two ways in which the figure of Cacus is surrounded by the pastoral. First, Cacus is a resident of the Aventine hill during Evander's time. As Evander tells Aeneas the story of Cacus, the cattle rustler is immersed in a pastoral setting. Second, accounts of the Cacus legend leading up to and during the Augustan period show Cacus as a singer and a shepherd. The third and final way in which Cacus combines the epic and the pastoral is through Polyphemus, who is one of the models Virgil uses for his Cacus (Münzer 1911, 31; Putnam 1965, 131; Galinsky 1966, 31n32; Hardie 1986, 115–116). Both characters are marked by gigantic size (Putnam 1965, 131), and both inhabit mountainside caves with large rocks for doors and gory thresholds (Hardie 1986, 115). Further, the story of Cacus's confrontation with Hercules mirrors and reverses the story of Polyphemus's confrontation with Odysseus. In *Odyssey* 9 it is Odysseus who flees and Polyphemus who tears off the peak of the mountain and throws it at him, while in *Aeneid* 8 it is Cacus who flees and Hercules who tears off the peak of the mountain (Hardie 1986, 115). Moreover, in the *Odyssey* it is Odysseus who uses fire as a weapon (burning out Polyphemus's eye) against an enemy with superior strength, while in the *Aeneid* Cacus uses fire against the superior Hercules. Though the action is inverted, the diametric nature of the reversals demonstrates Virgil's use of Polyphemus as a model for Cacus.

The Polyphemus on whom Virgil models Cacus is primarily the epic monster, but he is also the pastoral Polyphemus, with whom Virgil was also familiar. The astute reader who encounters Cacus in book 8 will recall Virgil's own description of Polyphemus in book 3:

Vix ea fatus erat summo cum monte videmus
 ipsum inter pecudes vasta se mole moventem
 pastorem Polyphemum et litora nota petentem,
 monstrum horrendum, informe, ingens, cui lumen ademptum.
 trunca manum pinus regit et vestigia firmat;
 lanigeræ comitantur oves; ea sola voluptas
 solamenque mali.

Aeneid 3.655–661

He had scarcely said these things when we see the shepherd Polyphemus himself moving his bulk from the mountaintop among his flock and seeking the well-known shore, a terrible monster, misshapen, prodigious, from whom the eye had been taken. A cut-off pine tree guides his hand and supports his steps. His woolly sheep accompany him, those ones his only enjoyment and comfort from evil.

Although Virgil's Polyphemus is primarily a horrifying monster ("monstrum horrendum, informe, ingens," *Aeneid* 3.658), he is also sympathetic, taking solace in the company of his flock (*Aeneid* 3.660–661).¹³ Virgil points out on three occasions that Polyphemus is a shepherd, calling him *pastorem* (*Aeneid* 3.657) and twice drawing attention to his flock (*Aeneid* 3.655, 660). An allusion to Theocritus's as well as Homer's Polyphemus, Virgil's Cacus is a sympathetic shepherd as well as a horrifying monster.

There are three ways in which Cacus invokes the pastoral. First, the Arcadian Evander is the one telling his story. Second, he is a shepherd in Livy. And third, he is modeled on Polyphemus. In spite of the fact that Virgil never calls Cacus a shepherd (or refers to any occupation for him other than oppression), his narrative context and his intertexts surround the monster with pastoral elements. Virgil's Cacus is an epic monster set in a pastoral scene both intertextually and at the level of the narrative. Unlike Polyphemus, Cacus does not combine the epic and the pastoral within himself, but like Polyphemus he is a focal point for the meeting of the two genres.

It is strange that in spite of the pastoral elements surrounding Cacus, Virgil removes all traces of the pastoral from his description of the monster. The lack of pastoral elements in the description of Cacus is especially surprising when one takes into account that the image of Cacus as a shepherd would generate sympathy

for the character, and elsewhere Virgil takes great care to make his villains sympathetic. One possible explanation for the odd lack of sympathy for Cacus is that Evander is describing Cacus at a festival in honor of Hercules, so he is subjectively inclined to present only the monstrous side of the villain. Evander, like Joyce's citizen, seeks purity in his representation of a monster, but the representation of a pure epic monster contains hidden elements of the pastoral that adulterate and hybridize the monster. One way in which that generic hybridity appears is in Cacus's reversal of the generic trajectory of Polyphemus. Polyphemus begins as an epic monster and then later Theocritus emphasizes his pastoral side. Cacus, on the other hand, was once a shepherd, but Virgil removes his pastoral side in favor of his epic monstrosity. At the level of the narrative the action of the Cacus story inverts the action of Homer's Polyphemus story (Hardie 1986, 115), and at the intertextual level Cacus inverts the generic trajectory of Polyphemus. Paradoxically, the character of Cacus invokes the pastoral precisely through the conspicuous removal of his pastoral qualities. Cacus is a focal point through which the *Aeneid* negotiates the relation between the epic and the pastoral.

The meeting of the epic and the pastoral in Virgil hybridizes Joyce's citizen on three levels. First, the citizen is a hybrid of multiple models. The intertextual and generic complexity of the citizen's classical models refuses to allow any direct, one-to-one correspondence. The citizen is not purely Polyphemus or Cacus, not pastoral or epic, not Homeric or Virgilian or Theocritean or Ovidian. Second, the citizen is a hybrid of multiple cultures. The epic and the pastoral elements of the citizen are not only drawn from Greek and Latin literature, but they also correspond to major themes of the Irish Revival. The gigantic size and strength of the citizen as well as his role as the criminal shepherd are both classical allusions and aspects of the citizen's revivalism. Third, the mixture of the epic and the pastoral makes the citizen a morally ambivalent character. The epic citizen is a gigantic and terrible monster, but the pastoral citizen is a sympathetic shepherd and an outlaw hero. When the citizen is Hercules he is a good hero, but his heroism is called into question by his violent rage; and when the citizen is Cacus he is a monstrous villain, but his evil is tempered by Cacus's pastoral context and intertext. Through the allusion to Hercules and Cacus, the citizen and the revivalist nationalism he represents refuse to be categorized and classified, but instead insist on a constitutive complexity at every level.

Gigantism and Universal History

Having explored the constitutive adulteration and hybridization of the citizen by tracing his intertextual and intercultural relations, I will proceed

to use this framework to explain the significance of the citizen's curse, "Hairy Iopas" (*Ulysses* 12.829). Schork asserts that Iopas has no connection to the subject of "Cyclops" and argues that it is significant only because it brings the *Aeneid* into play (Schork 1997, 132–133). While I agree that the mention of Iopas is striking and that it clearly alludes to the bard of Dido's court in the *Aeneid* (*Aeneid* 1.740–747), I propose that the name Iopas has a subtle but specific connection to the subject of "Cyclops." Iopas's song is a form of ancient history in the *Aeneid*, and "Cyclops" uses Iopas's history to criticize the Irish revivalist idea of history.

The song of Iopas does not appear directly in the *Aeneid*, but the poem describes the song as a cosmological history:

hic canit errantem lunam solisque labores,
unde hominum genus et pecudes, unde imber et ignes,
Arcturum pluviasque Hyadas geminosque Triones;
quid tantum Oceano properent se tingere soles
hiberni, vel quae tardis mora noctibus obstet.

Aeneid 1.742–746

He sings of the wandering moon and the labors of the sun, whence the race of men and beasts, whence rain and fires, of Arcturus and the rainy Hyades and the twin Triones, why winter suns are in such a hurry to dip in the Ocean, or what obstacle delays slow nights.

Iopas explains in his song the order of nature and the origin of humans. His prehistory leads up to and blends with the next song at Dido's banquet, namely Aeneas's recounting of the legend of the fall of Troy. Philip Hardie argues that the *Aeneid* narrates universal history in three phases: "firstly the Song of Iopas on the primeval truths of cosmology; secondly Dido's questions on Troy and the Trojan War; and thirdly her request for a complete account of the end of that war and of the subsequent wanderings of Aeneas, which will take us up to the present moment" (Hardie 1986, 65). In this scheme, the song of Iopas draws a line of historical continuity from the primal ordering of nature through the present of the narrative. As Hardie says, Virgil makes his readers "understand that the workings of history do eventually reveal the same underlying order that governs the natural world" (Hardie 1986, 66). Iopas brings elemental prehistory into the narrative present.

The alignment of elemental order and the workings of history is also at work in the story of Hercules and Cacus. Virgil's Cacus is not merely gigantic in the sense that he is large, but he is also Gigantic, since the Cacus episode draws on the myth of the Gigantomachy (Hardie 1986, 110–118). This myth, most famously recounted

in Hesiod's *Theogony*, is a tale of the elemental struggle of the Olympian gods against the Giants. Hardie notes the "elemental quality" of the battle between Hercules and Cacus, specifically remarking that "the effects of falling rock suggest those of the earthquake" (Hardie 1986, 114). The Gigantic echoes of Cacus's struggle make it "a recapitulation of the primitive battles of the gods against the Titans and Giants, and emblem of what might be called a Roman cosmogony, functioning as a grand and universalizing prelude to the themes of human history that ensue" (Hardie 1986, 117). Cacus's Gigantic nature incorporates the elemental prehistory of the universal order into the history of Rome.

The Gigantic struggle of Hercules and Cacus brings elemental order into the narrative present, but a further step aligns the elemental order with Virgil's own Augustan period. At the end of *Aeneid* 8, shortly after the story of Hercules and Cacus, the scene of the battle of Actium on Aeneas's new shield is once again an elemental struggle. The ships that clash in the naval battle are like mountains:

pelago credas innare revulsas
Cycladas aut montis concurrere montibus altos,
tanta mole viri turritis puppibus instant.

Aeneid 8.691–693

You would believe that the torn-up Cyclades were sailing on the sea or that high mountains were clashing against mountains, in such a mass were the men standing on the turret-bearing decks.

And after the Gigantic battle, the shield shows the new world order:

incedunt victae longo ordine gentes,
quam variae linguis, habitu tam vestis et armis.
hic Nomadum genus et discinctos Mulciber Afros,
hic Lelegas Carasque sagittiferosque Gelonos
finxerat; Euphrates ibat iam mollior undis,
extremique hominum Morini, Rhenusque bicornis,
indomitique Dahae, et pontem indignatus Araxes.

Aeneid 8.722–728

The conquered peoples proceed in a long line, as varied in languages as in custom of dress and arms. Here Vulcan had depicted the race of Nomads and ungirt Africans, here the Lelegians and the Carians and the arrow-bearing Gelonians. The Euphrates was flowing more soft with waves, and the Morini,

most remote of people, the two-horned Rhine, the wild Dahae, and Araxes,
resentful of the bridge.

The repetition of the Gigantomachy in Virgil's contemporary history brings the historical order of the state into alignment with the natural order of the world. Hardie explains: "It is a feature of such cosmogonic myths that they may be re-enacted in later times, particularly in their function as a model for ordering the social polity" (Hardie 1986, 118). Virgil's cosmogony and Gigantomachy link primal history to the present. The Gigantic struggles of the *Aeneid* suggest that the Roman state is the natural order of the universe. The poem appropriates elemental pre-history for Rome in an effort to legitimize the universal claims of the Roman Empire.

As the use of Gigantic conflict in the *Aeneid* aims at a universalization of Roman history, so the technique of Gigantism in "Cyclops" points toward the universalization of Irish history. In "Cyclops," as in classical myth, Gigantic battles are elemental struggles. When the citizen hurls a biscuit tin at Bloom, the impact registers as a seismic event, which an interpolation reports in mock scientific language:

The catastrophe was terrific and instantaneous in its effect. The observatory of Dunsink registered in all eleven shocks, all of the fifth grade of Mercalli's scale, and there is no record of a similar seismic disturbance in our island since the earthquake of 1534, the year of the rebellion of Silken Thomas. The epicenter appears to have been that part of the metropolis which constitutes the Inn's Quay ward and the parish of Saint Michan covering a surface of fortyone acres, two roods and one square pole or perch. (*Ulysses* 12.1858–1865)

The Gigantic citizen's throw surpasses all of the bombs and other human disturbances and registers as an elemental, natural phenomenon.¹⁴ Like Cacus, the citizen is not merely gigantic, but Gigantic, embodying elemental forces.

The elemental nature of the citizen and his confrontation with Bloom suggests a similar universalizing effort to that of the *Aeneid*. The technique of gigantism, including the allusion to the Gigantic Cacus, pulls into a Dublin pub the fundamental natural order. "Cyclops" suggests that the gigantic legends of the revivalists are an effort to create an Irish cosmogony that will "function as a grand and universalizing prelude to the themes of human history that ensue" (Hardie 1986, 117). Like the *Aeneid*, the revivalists use legendary history to forge a link between the creation of the natural order and the contemporary state. The revivalist legends of an earlier, Gigantic age not only tell the history of the people of Ireland, but

also encompass the ancient and primal world of natural history. The modern history of Ireland and the Irish state flows from the legendary Irish cosmogony.

For the revivalists, the historical technique of gigantism is an effort to recover a purely and authentically Irish history. O'Grady, whose *History of Ireland* was extremely influential in the historical thinking of the Irish Revival (Lyons 1979, 33–35; Gibson 2002, 108n22), is insistent that Irish history must reject English culture and the English idea of history (Gibson 2002, 112). Turning away from scientific historical investigations, O'Grady sought to “escape from positive history and unyielding despotic fact” (O'Grady 1881, 57; quoted in Gibson 2002, 113). The result is a historiography that makes no distinction between legend and history. The revivalist Lady Gregory, for example, is interested in “myth turned into history, or history turned into myth” (Gregory 1909, 49; quoted in Gibson 2002, 109). For Gregory, there is no distinction between the ancient past and the historical present: “The names change from age to age, that is all” (Gregory 1918, iii; quoted in Gibson 2002, 113). Gigantism, which aligns legendary or cosmological prehistory with the historical present, represents for the revivalists a rejection of the positivist and fact-based British idea of history and a recovery of an authentically Irish mode.

The Gigantism of “Cyclops” criticizes the revivalist idea of history by exposing the cultural hybridity in the supposedly purely Irish technique of gigantism. Joyce's allusion to Virgil's Gigantism and to Iopas's appropriation of elemental prehistory for Rome points out that the Revival's authentically Irish technique is in fact classically European. The Revival's search for purity appropriates for Ireland what is actually a broader literary and cultural phenomenon. “Cyclops” dramatizes the revivalist appropriation of techniques from foreign cultures. One interpolation reports, “A most interesting discussion . . . on the revival of ancient Gaelic sports and the importance of physical culture, as understood in ancient Greece and ancient Rome and ancient Ireland, for the development of the race” (*Ulysses* 12.897–901). This passage suggests that the Gaelic Athletic Association, by reviving ancient Irish athletic tradition, also revives ancient Greek and ancient Roman tradition. The citizen claims the heritage of Greece and Rome for Ireland, and argues that the British Empire has suppressed the Irish history of contact with Greece and Rome (Allen 2010, 23). He complains:

Where are our missing twenty millions of Irish should be here today instead of four, our lost tribes? And our potteries and textiles, the finest in the whole world! And our wool that was sold in Rome in the time of Juvenal . . . Where are the Greek merchants that came through the pillars of Hercules, the Gibraltar now grabbed by the foe of mankind, with gold and Tyrian purple to sell in Wexford at the fair of Carmen? Read Tacitus and Ptolemy, even Giraldus Cambrensis. (*Ulysses* 12.1240–1251, quoted in Allen 2010, 23)

For the citizen, the Irish are denied their rightful inheritance of Greek and Roman cultural contact. Greece and Rome belong to the Irish, and as much as revivalist nationalism claims the uniqueness of Ireland and the independence of Irish culture, it also claims the authority of ancient Greece and Rome.

Though one might understand the previous passages as suggesting an intuitive understanding and ancient association between ancient Ireland and ancient Greece and ancient Rome, another passage makes even clearer the appropriation of foreign cultures for Ireland. When an interpolation lists the citizen's trophies of "Irish heroes and heroines of antiquity" (*Ulysses* 12.176), the catalogue includes names like "Dante Alighieri" (*Ulysses* 12.182), "Christopher Columbus" (*Ulysses* 12.183), and "Cleopatra" (*Ulysses* 12.188). These are not Irish heroes, but legendary figures from non-Irish cultures. The appropriation is even more intense when foreign figures gain Irish names like "Michelangelo Hayes" (*Ulysses* 12.189), "Patrick W. Shakespeare" (*Ulysses* 12.190–191), and "Brian Confucius" (*Ulysses* 12.191). In spite of his desire for strict Irish purity, the citizen also desires to make all heroes and heroines Irish. Among the citizen's trophies, there are no heroes that are not Irish heroes and there is no history that is not Irish history.

The difference between Joyce's use of specific allusions like the one to Virgil's Cacus and the revivalists' use of classical literary technique in their treatment of Irish tradition is that Joyce places Irish literature in an intertextual relationship with classical literature, while the revivalists simply appropriate a classical idea. *Ulysses* is Irish literature, but it is Irish literature that acknowledges interdependence with other literatures. The revivalists would have a purely Irish discourse stand on its own, but in order to invent such a discourse, they must hide within it the foreign discourses they appropriate. O'Grady and the Irish revivalists make Irish history universal history and universal history Irish history. *Ulysses* places the Irish tradition in relation to the larger European tradition.

By setting his own Gigantomachy in Kiernan's pub, Joyce brings the primal struggle of prehistory directly into the urban present of Dublin. The result is an absurd mixture of normal inhabitants of Dublin and a huge smoke-breathing monster. The legendary hurl of the biscuit tin meets with scientific measurements of seismic waves. This is not, however, merely satire of the gigantism of revivalist nationalism. By mocking the absurd giants of the revival, Joyce imports the legendary figures into everyday Dublin in a way the revivalists, who focus on heroic legends and not on progressive and developmental historical time, cannot do. The inhabitants of Dublin do live with the Gigantic citizen, and nobody remarks his presence as unusual or surprising.¹⁵ In "Cyclops," the patrons of Kiernan's pub live with a legendary history without understanding the complex of relations that forms the legends and their experience of those legends. Joyce's chapter brings together elements of the Irish and European literary traditions in order to

demonstrate that Irish nationalism is neither a reclamation of a purely Irish past nor an anachronistic invention of tradition, but rather a nexus of disparate and often contradictory elements. In contrast to the purity of revivalist nationalism, "Cyclops" sees the Irish nation as an intertextual and intercultural relation.

Conclusion

The Irish revivalist nationalists are not alone in their search for pure and ancient cultural roots. As Benedict Anderson argues, it is an almost invariable feature of nationalist movements that they construct a shared cultural history that legitimizes the newly forming imagined community (Anderson 2006, 5–7). It is also a feature of such constructions that their agents view the work not as a construction but as a reclamation of an ancient past. Joyce scholars like Lloyd and Nolan (not to mention Duffy, Cheng, Gibson, and many more) show that in spite of all of its criticism of the Irish nationalists and their violent methods, *Ulysses* actively participates in the nationalist project and the formation of Irish culture. Joyce's novel does not, however, participate in the revivalist project of building an imagined community on the foundation of pure and native Irish language and literature. Just as Joyce rejected Gaelic for English, the cultural past *Ulysses* reclaims is not specifically Irish, but broadly European.

Joyce's rejection of the revivalist vision of Irish purity does not, however, indicate a rejection of Irish culture. Even though the ideal of a unified and homogenous Irish identity is oppressive, a nation cannot overthrow colonial oppression without a national culture (Fanon 1963, 157; Bhabha 1994, 70). But rather than in an ideal of Irish purity, *Ulysses* imagines Irish national culture in the reality of Irish life. Interwoven in the real community of the Dublin of *Ulysses* is a culture that has more complex roots than any of its inhabitants understand. The citizen is a prominent example of this phenomenon. His character is an embodiment of the Irish national imagined community interacting with the real community of Dubliners. His Gigantic nature separates him from his companions and causes him to dominate the scene, but he is nevertheless still a member of the group. In the citizen, image meets reality. As part of the group of drinkers in the pub, the citizen and his nationalist myth of pure Irish culture is just one part of the real national culture. He is joined by the pub itself as well as the other men in it, including the Hungarian Jew Bloom, who is a member of the real community and a participant in the national culture in spite of the citizen's attempts to exclude him. "Cyclops" does depict a national culture, but one that is intercultural as well as intertextual.

The citizen embodies the ambivalence and hybridity of Irish national culture. His Gigantic character grows from many models and plays many roles. One model

is the historical figure Michael Cusack. The real Cusack merges with a second model in the legendary giants of the Irish cultural revival. The citizen finds a third model in Homer's Polyphemus, and more in the literary reincarnations of Polyphemus in Theocritus and Ovid. In some ways more intensely than any of these, the citizen follows Virgil's Cacus, who brings along Livy. The mixture of historical and legendary figures as well as the mixture of Irish and European traditions elides distinctions of time, space, and culture. In "Cyclops," one can be an Irish nationalist and still embrace classical European culture—in fact, in order to be a true nationalist, one must acknowledge the classical European (and English) culture in the modern Irish national culture. The citizen also embodies the hybridity and ambivalence of the Irish national culture through the remarkable variety of roles he plays in the politics of "Cyclops." Through Cacus, the citizen is a lawless shepherd, violent terrorist, and foreign tyrant. Through Hercules, he is a raging madman, brutal policeman, and heroic liberator. Through Augustus, he is a repressive monarch masquerading as a republican citizen. No one label describes the citizen. He is a figure of hybridity itself.

It would be a mistake to attempt to use the political roles of the citizen to articulate a specific political position that "Cyclops," *Ulysses*, or even Joyce advocates. Literature has the advantage over political rhetoric that it has no obligation to form a coherent position or argument or to recommend a particular course of action. The parallels of the citizen with Hercules and Cacus do not simply endorse or condemn nationalism. "Cyclops" shows that being Irish means being criminal and police, subject and sovereign, citizen and tyrant, pacifist and militant. It also means reading both Irish legendary texts like the *Táin Bó Cúailnge* and classical Roman ones like the *Aeneid*. "Cyclops" uses the *Aeneid* to make the citizen more than a monocular and monologic representative of revivalist nationalism. He embodies the polyvalent politics of membership in the imagined Irish community.

3

The Virgilian Past of Nationalism

In the previous chapter I argued that Joyce associates the revivalist nationalism of the citizen with both Cacus and Hercules in the *Aeneid*, articulating a view that both valorizes and vilifies revivalist nationalism. In the present chapter I argue that by associating Irish revivalist nationalism with the *Aeneid*, Joyce suggests that Virgil's construction of ancient roots for Italian identity is analogous to the revivalist construction of ancient roots for Irish identity. It is surprising that the *Aeneid*, for Joyce, would be a poem of nationalism rather than imperialism, but I will show in this chapter that Virgil's poem indeed promotes Italian nationalism. In the *Aeneid*, Virgil writes a story of Rome's past that utilizes the power of grief for ancient Italian deaths to construct a new Italian identity for the Augustan period. As in the first *Eclogue*,¹ Virgil presents Italians as victims of tragedy, but in the *Aeneid* the sacrifices the ancient Italians make will become the foundation of the Augustan Italian state. Joyce's "Cyclops" suggests that such a Virgilian use of the past is characteristic of Irish nationalism, and it constructs the *Aeneid* as a nationalist rather than imperialist epic.

One way to look at the construction of the *Aeneid* as a nationalist poem is to see that although the nation is a modern phenomenon and it did not exist as such in antiquity, nevertheless ancient political formations and identities share with modern ones some of the key characteristics of nations and nationalism. Modern nationalists (and critics and theorists of nationalism) use ancient texts and examples to make sense of the modern world, in the process creating and exploiting similarities between ancient and modern thought. To the extent that *Ulysses* is a text that participates in the construction of modern Irish identity and does so in large part by means of intertextuality with the *Aeneid*, Virgil's poem forms an important part of modern Irish identity. It should not be at all surprising, then, to find characteristics of nationalist identity in the *Aeneid*. In this chapter I examine the way in which the *Aeneid*, like modern nationalist texts, constructs a political identity based on an association with a bounded, territorial space by projecting the unity of that space onto the ancient past. The nationalist past, as Homi Bhabha explains,

“is not necessarily a faithful sign of historical memory but a strategy of representing authority in terms of the artifice of the archaic” (Bhabha 1994, 52). The past of the *Aeneid*, like nationalist pasts, represents present authority in the guise of the ancient. In “Cyclops,” Joyce engages with the Irish nationalist construction of a history of the Irish territory, projecting the modern nation onto the ancient past. Like the Irish nationalists, Virgil, in the second half of the *Aeneid*, constructs ancient roots for a new collective identity.

In “Cyclops,” *Ulysses* separates its own construction of the Irish community from that of the revivalist nationalists represented by the citizen. In particular, “Cyclops” constructs an imagined community out of the present heterogeneity and hybridity of semicolonial Ireland, while the revivalists constructed the Irish imagined community on the foundation of pure and ancient roots. In his resistant treatment of the Revival, Joyce exposes the hybridity and modernity of the ancient history that men like the citizen imagined. It is my contention in this chapter that Virgil’s epic constructs ancient roots for Rome in a way that *Ulysses* resists. While the *Aeneid* does insist on the complex hybridity of the ancient Italian community, it also focuses its poetic energy on unifying the ancient past of Italy as a foundation for the new imagination of the Augustan Roman community. Nevertheless, the resistance in Joyce’s reception of Virgil does not mean that the two do not have similar strategies for engaging with national consciousness. Both construct out of hybridity and multiplicity a unified image of the nation, even if they differ in their engagement with the ancient past. In the previous chapter, I stressed hybridity and discontinuity in the narrative of *Ulysses*. Nevertheless, concomitant with the hybridity of “Cyclops,” the pub is a site of community in *Ulysses*. The novel serves as a cultural touchstone allowing Irish national identification, even as it distances itself from the oppressive Irish purity of the revivalists. Like *Ulysses*, the *Aeneid* also constructs a unified community out of hybridity and multiplicity, and in this way even as Joyce resists the construction of ancient roots for nationalism in the *Aeneid* and the Revival, he can also find in the *Aeneid* strategies for the construction of a hybrid and heterogeneous national identity.

To the extent that the *Aeneid* is a nationalist poem, it is a poem of Italian rather than Roman nationalism. Ronald Syme points out that Virgil’s *Aeneid* is a poem not only of Rome, but of all of Italy. This, he argues, reflects Augustus’s political reshaping of Rome into a territorial Italian state.² The unification of Italy was one of the foundations of Augustus’s power,³ and the *Aeneid* reflects the new image of Rome. For example, Virgil’s vision of Actium on the shield of Aeneas (*Aeneid* 8.675–730) shows Augustus as the leader of Italians against the armies of the East. The presentation of Augustus’s war against Antony as a war against foreigners, instead of the civil war that it really was, helps to construct an image of

Italy as a unified state. The *Aeneid* goes further than this, however, in its construction of a unified Italy. In spite of the historical fact of Rome's ancient conquest of the surrounding Italian areas, Virgil's poem projects the new Italian unity onto the ancient past. In the *Aeneid*, Italian unity is not merely a political policy, but a natural and permanent state to which Augustan Rome gives political expression. The projection of Italian unity onto the ancient past overwrites the historical Roman conquest of Italy and appropriates for Rome the deaths and sacrifices of ancient Italians.

The Italian nationalism of the *Aeneid*, however, is not straightforward, and the civil war of the second half of the poem is also a war of conquest by Trojan invaders. From one perspective Virgil casts as a civil war what was really a war of conquest, but from another perspective Virgil casts as a foreign invasion what was really a war between Italians. Aeneas is both Italian and not Italian, and the war is both civil and colonial. The dynamics of Rome and Italy—of civil war and foreign invasion—are a major theme especially of the second half of the poem (Barchiesi 2008). Just as Ireland's proximity to England and the long Anglicization of the island made the Irish War of Independence a kind of civil war between Irish nationalists and unionists, the proximity of Italy and Rome and the long Romanization of the peninsula make it easy for Virgil to cast the Roman conquest of Italy as a civil war. The semicolonial status of Italy, however, also creates an undercurrent of nationalist resistance to Roman imperialism, not on the fringes of the empire, but in Italy itself. It is this semicolonial resistance that *Ulysses* activates in its intertextual reception of the *Aeneid*, and such a reception suggests that it will be productive to understand the politics of the *Aeneid* not in terms of support for or resistance to Augustus and his regime, but rather in terms of the relationship between Roman imperialism and Italian nationalism. The *Aeneid* is a poem of Italy, and this, somewhat paradoxically, both naturalizes the Roman conquest of Italy and reimagines Roman identity as Italian.

The *Aeneid*'s naturalization of the unification of Italy means that in important respects the war in the second half of the poem, a war fought between Italians and the Trojans who have Italian ancestry and Italian destiny, is a civil war.⁴ There are, moreover, subtle indications that the Latin War is not just a civil war, but a fratricidal war that violates kinship. For example, when Juno calls on Allecto to foment the war, she explains:

tu potes unanimos armare in proelia fratres
atque odiis versare domos, tu verbera tectis
funereasque inferre faces.

Aeneid 7.335–337

You are able to arm for battle like-minded brothers, to upend houses with hatred; you are able to set scourges and funereal torches upon homes.

When she starts the Latin War, Juno specifically summons the power to divide homes and to drive brothers to fight each other. Although it seems counterintuitive, the *Aeneid* portrays Italy as a natural whole by representing it as a region torn by civil and fratricidal war.

While scholars of the *Aeneid* largely agree on their identification of Aeneas's war as a civil war, they do not agree on the significance of this fact. Some argue that the representation of the Latin War as a civil war helps to make a parallel between Aeneas's actions and those of Augustus, though there is some debate over whether the parallel provides a positive model or a negative precedent for the *princeps*.⁵ Others suggest that the presentation of a civil war in the ancient past of Italy relegates strife and disorder to the past and reserves the future for peace (Hardie 1986, 135; Williams 1990, 23). A third way of reading civil war in the *Aeneid* is as a tool for advancing Augustan ideology. The representation of Actium as a war against the East, for example, advances the Augustan ideology of Orientalism by defining Roman identity against a set of negative, Eastern characteristics (Quint 1993, 21–31). The Italianization of the Trojans is also a manifestation of Orientalism, as it converts “degenerate Asians” into the descendants of hardy Italian stock (Cairns 1989, 127–128). I propose that the ideological context of civil war in the *Aeneid* is both broader and more positive. The *Aeneid* defines Roman identity not only against the negative characteristics of the East, but by a positive, geographical association of Romanness with Italy.

In describing the ideological context of civil war in the *Aeneid* as positive, I do not mean to suggest that Virgil's ideology is good or moral. By projecting Italian unity onto the ancient past, the *Aeneid* erases and overwrites a historical conquest. The peoples of Italy being conquered by early Romans would have seen the wars less as tragedy than as injustice. Not only does the *Aeneid* overwrite the injustice of conquest with the tragedy of fratricide, but the poem also generates emotional power by mourning the deaths of legendary Italians as tragic losses. Nationalism overcomes the individual experience of death and loss with collective identity, and it draws power from collective mourning (Anderson 2006, 9–11). The *Aeneid* draws such power not only from the deaths of legendary Roman heroes, but also from the deaths of Italians, such as Lausus, whose historical analogues fought and died to remain independent from Rome. The poem's poignant representations of the deaths of Aeneas's enemies might seem to threaten the image of Italian unity, but by representing the Latin War as a civil war, the poem draws Aeneas's enemies into the role of Roman heroes. Fratricidal war in the *Aeneid* is reassuring for Romans

because it naturalizes Italian unity, because it obscures the conquest of Italy, and because the deaths of heroes on both sides of the war become keystones for Roman collective identification.

Italian Unity in the *Aeneid*

Although in Virgil's time the unity of Italy was a recent development, the *Aeneid* represents Italy as a natural and permanent entity. Nowhere is the image of Italy as a natural whole more forceful than in the depiction of Actium at the center of the shield of Aeneas. First, Octavian appears on the scene not as the leader of Romans, but as the leader of Italians: "hinc Augustus agens Italos in proelia Caesar" ("Here is Augustus Caesar leading the Italians into battle"; 8.678). Then, the unity of Octavian's Italians emerges in contrast to the multiplicity of Antony's foreign forces: "hinc ope barbarica variisque Antonius armis" ("on the other side Antony with foreign wealth and varied arms"; *Aeneid* 8.685) and "quam variae linguis, habitu tam vestis et armis" ("as varied in languages as in manner of dress and in arms"; *Aeneid* 8.723; Quint 1993, 25; Toll 1997, 45). Moreover, the opposition on the shield between the unity of Italy and the multiplicity of the others is not merely political, but natural as well. The battle is not a battle between political enemies or contrasting ideas, but seems to involve the forces of nature: "pelago credas innare revulsas / Cycladas aut montis concurrere montibus altos" ("You would believe that the Cyclades, uprooted, were sailing on the sea or that high mountains were rushing against mountains"; 8.691–692; Hardie 1986, 97–105). The gods themselves even take part:

omnigenumque deum monstra et latrator Anubis
contra Neptunum et Venerem contraque Minervam
tela tenent.

Aeneid 8.698–700

Monstrous forms of every kind of god and the barker Anubis wield weapons
against Neptune and Venus and against Minerva.

Nature and the Roman gods endorse the Italian cause and the unified Italian army. And finally, although Octavian celebrates his triumph in Rome, it is nevertheless to the Italian gods that he makes his offering: "at Caesar, triplici invectus Romana triumpho / moenia, dis Italis votum immortale sacrabat" ("But Caesar, carried into the Roman walls in a triple triumph, was dedicating an everlasting offering to the Italian gods"; *Aeneid* 8.714–715). Octavian wins at Actium with the armies of a unified Italy, and when he returns to Rome he dedicates an everlasting

offering to the gods of Italy. The unified Italy that won at Actium is in this passage not a political idea, but a natural, divine, and permanent state of being.

The representation of Actium in the *Aeneid* portrays the historically recent unity of Italy as a natural state, and elsewhere the poem confirms the permanence of Italian unity by projecting it onto the ancient past. Leaving aside for the moment the question of the Trojans' place in Italy, the poem represents the already established, pre-Trojan, Italian communities as sharing a homogeneous culture. In book 12, for example, when Jupiter and Juno make the compromise that allows the end of hostilities, it is a compromise that reconciles Italians with Trojans. The concession that Juno demands is that Rome be Italian rather than Trojan: "sit Romana potens Itala virtute propago: / occidit, occideritque sinas cum nomine Troia" ("Let the Roman progeny be strong with Italian virtue: Troy has fallen, allow it to have fallen with its name"; *Aeneid* 12.827–828). The settlement represents one side of the war as Italian. Though the Rutulians and Latins have been fighting not only the Trojans, but also the Etruscans, Juno's demand conveniently forgets the internal Italian conflict. It is possible that Juno is counting Evander's Etruscan people as Arcadians, since they are originally Arcadian colonists. Whatever her reasons, however, she considers the Italians as one unified army fighting against the Trojans. While the compromise admits the dual heritage of Rome as both Trojan and Italian, it treats the Italian part of Roman heritage as one homogeneous culture.⁶ From the view of the divine compromise, Rome is not a Trojan and Latin city that will conquer the various communities of Italy; rather, the Trojans join an already existing Italian culture.

Even though the divine compromise treats Italian culture as homogeneous, however, most of the second half of the *Aeneid* makes distinctions between the various peoples of Italy.⁷ The Rutulians are not the same people as the Latins, and, with the exceptions of Mezentius and Lausus, the Etruscans fight against their fellow Italians. Amata gives voice to the position that the Italian communities are distinct when she attempts to persuade Latinus that Turnus is a foreigner:

si gener externa petitur de gente Latinis,
idque sedet, Faunique premunt te iussa parentis,
omnem equidem sceptris terram quae libera nostris
dissidet externam reor et sic dicere divos.
et Turno, si prima domus repetatur origo,
Inachus Acrisiusque patres mediaeque Mycenae.

Aeneid 7.367–372

If a son-in law is sought from a people foreign to the Latins, and it is established, and if the commands of your father Faunus compel you, I, for my

part, think that all the land that stands free outside of our sovereignty is foreign, and that the gods say so. And as for Turnus, if the first origin of his house should be recalled, his forefathers are Inachus and Acrisius, and (his original home is) the heart of Mycenae.

Amata makes two arguments against the unity of Italy in this speech. She argues first that the political independence of the Italian communities constitutes foreignness, and second that Turnus is not ultimately of Italian ancestry. Both arguments insist on Italian diversity rather than homogeneity, the former political diversity and the latter ancestral.

Amata's arguments, however, do not ultimately undermine Italian unity. The poem does take her reasoning seriously, but does not allow her argument to deny the natural homogeneity of Italy. Amata's argument that Turnus is foreign to the Latins because he is not under Latinus's political control is powerful. The facts are on Amata's side. The political reality of ancient Italy is one of many distinct states, only much later to be unified by Rome. The *Aeneid* responds to Amata's position by positing a preexisting cultural unity that will only find political expression through Italy's Roman future. It is an Italian, Numanus Remulus, who argues the position most forcefully:

quis deus Italiam, quae vos dementia adegit?
non hic Atridae nec fandi fictor Ulixes:
durum a stirpe genus natos ad flumina primum
deferimus saevoque gelu duramus et undis;
venatu invigilant pueri silvasque fatigant,
flectere ludus equos et spicula tendere cornu.
at patiens operum parvoque adsueta iuventus
aut rastris terram domat aut quatit oppida bello.
omne aevum ferro teritur, versaque iuvenecum
terga fatigamus hasta, nec tarda senectus
debilitat viris animi mutatque vigorem:
canitiem galea premimus, semperque recentis
comportare iuvat praedas et vivere rapto.

Aeneid 9.601–613

What god, what madness, has driven you to Italy? The sons of Atreus are not here, nor the deviser of speech Ulysses: We, a race hardy by descent, bring our sons first to streams and harden them in the savage cold waves; when they grow to boyhood they stay awake hunting and tire out the

woods, their play is to tame horses and to shoot arrows with a bow. And the youth, enduring labor and accustomed to small means, either subdue the land with hoes or shake towns with war. Our whole lifetime is spent with iron, and we goad the backs of cattle with a reversed spear, and slow old age does not weaken our powers of the mind and change our strength; we push down white hair with a helmet, and it always delights us to collect fresh plunder and to live on what we have seized.

Numanus begins by wondering why the Trojans have come to Italy, using a name for the whole peninsula rather than any individual region or community. He follows his invocation of Italy as a whole with use of the first person plural to describe cultural practices. Numanus's "we" is not the Rutulians, but the Italians. Although Amata is correct that Italy is politically diverse, the prevailing opinion, or rather assumption, even among those like Numanus and Juno who share Amata's goals, is that Italy is culturally homogeneous.⁸ Although ancient Italy is made up of independent political communities, the natural unity of Italian character traits and cultural practices already awaits its Roman political expression.

Amata, however, also argues for Italian cultural diversity when she asserts that Turnus is foreign by virtue of his Greek ancestry (*Aeneid* 7.371–372). Turnus is not only politically independent of Latinus, but also culturally Greek. Amata partially undermines her own argument when she points out Turnus's kinship ties with Latinus: "quid cura antiqua tuorum / et consanguineo totiens data dextera Turno?" ("What of your old care for your own people, and your right hand so often offered to Turnus your kinsman?" *Aeneid* 7.365–366). Nevertheless, in spite of Turnus's current kinship with Latinus, his blood is also Greek. For Amata, Turnus is both Italian and not Italian. Moreover, Amata is not the only voice the *Aeneid* uses to assert Turnus's cultural foreignness. Three similes in book 12 associate Turnus with foreign geography, while others associate Aeneas with Italian geography.⁹ The geographical similes are important because they associate Turnus with Thrace and Carthage as his actions separate him from Italian virtue, while at the same time linking the Eastern Aeneas with Italian geography as his actions prove him worthy of Italian virtue. The link between geographical and cultural identity is crucial to the representation of Italy in the *Aeneid* (Ando 2002, 137–141), but it comes at the cost of alienating Turnus. The alienation of Turnus through Amata's speech and the geographical similes, however, paradoxically supports the cultural homogeneity of Italy. When Amata wants to assert the cultural foreignness of Turnus, she cannot rely on the separation between the Latins and the Rutulians, but she must call him Greek. When the poem wishes to alienate Turnus in book 12, it does not associate him with some other part of Italy, but chooses Thrace and

Carthage.¹⁰ Alien cultures are not from elsewhere in Italy, but from outside of Italy.

The *Aeneid*'s greatest challenge to the unity of Italian culture is the introduction of the Trojans into the mix. The Trojans will play a large part in the future of Italy, but they appear to be an ethnically distinct group. Like Turnus, the Trojans are both Italian and foreign. On the one hand, the Trojans' ancestors are from Italy. The Trojan Penates explain:

est locus, Hesperiam Grai cognomine dicunt,
terra antiqua, potens armis atque ubere glabrae;
Oenotri coluere viri; nunc fama minores
Italiam dixisse ducis de nomine gentem.
hae nobis propriae sedes, hinc Dardanus ortus
Iasiusque pater, genus a quo principe nostrum.

Aeneid 3.163–168

There is a place, the Greeks name it Hesperia, an ancient land, strong in arms and in the fertility of the soil; Oenotrian men cultivated it. Now the story is that their descendants have called the community Italy after the name of their leader. This is our own home, from here Dardanus was born, and Iasius the father, from which founder came our race.

Italy is not only the ancestral origin of the Trojans, but also the true home of the Trojan gods. On the other hand, gods also call Aeneas a foreigner in Italy. Twice Aeneas fulfills a role divinely allotted to an outsider. First, Faunus tells Latinus that Lavinia must marry a foreigner:

ne pete conubiis natam sociare Latinis,
o mea progenies, thalamis neu crede paratis;
externi venient generi.

Aeneid 7.96–98

Do not seek to join your daughter in a Latin marriage, my son, and do not trust in the wedding that is planned; a foreign son-in-law will come.

In this case, Faunus specifies that the foreigner must not be Latin, and so one might still consider Aeneas Italian, but not Latin. In the second instance of Aeneas performing a role reserved for an outsider, however, the outsider is specifically defined as non-Italian. When Aeneas is at Pallanteum, Evander explains that the

Etruscans are postponing war against the Rutulians because they require a foreign general. A seer has instructed the people:

o Maoniae delecta iuventus,
flos veterum virtusque virum, quos iustus in hostem
fert dolor et merita accendit Mezentius ira,
nulli fas Italo tantam subiungere gentem:
externos optate duces.

Aeneid 8.499–503

Chosen youth of Maonia, the flower and excellence of men of old, whom a righteous grievance drives against the enemy and whom Mezentius ignites with deserved anger, it is right to subject such a people to no Italian: choose foreign leaders.

Since Aeneas is the general who will in fact lead the Etruscans, he must not be Italian. The gods declare both that the true country of the Trojans is Italy, and that Aeneas is not Italian.

While the dual status of the Trojans as both foreign and Italian may seem to threaten the premise of Italian unity, in fact it does just the opposite. When the Trojans are foreigners, they are foreign because they are not Italian, and so Italian identity is constituted in opposition to their not-Italian identity. Juno and Numanus Remulus, in subscribing to the idea that the Trojans are foreign to Italy, define Italian culture as a cohesive whole against a non-Italian other. On the other hand, the otherness of the Trojan enemy presents a problem for the unity of the later Roman Italy. If Aeneas is the ancestor of Augustus, the Trojan origin of the Roman government threatens to make Rome separate from the rest of Italy. The *Aeneid* partially deals with this problem by assimilating the Trojans into the preexisting Italian culture. Juno's compromise ensures that the Trojans will speak Latin and adopt Italian customs. The Trojans are absorbed into the proto-Roman Italian culture that includes such customs as the opening of the gates of war (*Aeneid* 8.601–622) and the sacrifice to Hercules (*Aeneid* 8.102–307).¹¹ The representation of later Roman customs as ancient Italian cultural practices means that Roman culture does not come into existence as a fusion of Troy and Italy after the arrival of Aeneas, but rather Roman culture has always already existed in Italy. The Trojans merely add themselves to an established and unified Italian culture. The more complete solution to the problem, however, is simply to make the Trojans Italians after all. In fact, Aeneas's Italian ancestry makes him even more Italian than Turnus and Evander. The *Aeneid* can have it both ways.¹² Aeneas is both the inimical

other against whom Italians define their identity and the heroic embodiment of Italian virtues.

As is true of most aspects of the *Aeneid*, the idea that Italy is naturally and culturally unified and homogeneous is neither simple nor unchallenged. Amata is correct when she points out that Italy contains many politically independent states. Moreover, the various communities of Italy have diverse ancestry. Turnus is Mycenaean and Evander is Arcadian. Aeneas, who is ancestrally Italian and whose people will play a large part in the destiny of Italy, is a foreign invader. Alongside these complications, however, the *Aeneid* takes as a basic premise the unity and cultural homogeneity of Italy. When Aeneas identifies his *patria* to Dido, it is Italy (*Aeneid* 4.345–347). When Numanus Remulus proclaims his cultural superiority, he praises Italian culture (*Aeneid* 9.601). When Amata argues that Turnus is foreign, it is not enough that he is Rutulian, but she must call him Mycenaean as well (*Aeneid* 7.371–372). It is difficult to say whether Virgil intended to posit the cultural unity of Italy in order to complicate and undermine it, or whether he meant the poem to overcome its own objections to the idea.¹³ Whatever the poet intended, the *Aeneid* does represent Italy as a natural whole that achieves a political manifestation in the later Roman practice.

The *Aeneid*'s refusal to construct a straightforward and unchallenged Italian unity reappears in the pub of the "Cyclops" episode of *Ulysses*. In an episode heavily dependent on *Aeneid* 8, Joyce displays the simultaneous unity and hybridity of Irish identity. As both Lloyd (1993) and Nolan (2000) argue, the nationalists in the pub strive for a purely Irish discourse, but the episode itself dramatizes the heterogeneity of their speech. In chapter 2 I argued that the episode exposes the classical Roman presence in the supposedly purely Irish ancient roots the nationalists construct. Moreover, the outsider Bloom, whose father was a Jewish, Hungarian immigrant, represents to the nationalists a dangerous adulteration of the purity of the Irish nation. Nevertheless, in response to the hybridity of the scene in the pub and the nationalists' efforts to exclude him, Bloom asserts a geographical definition of the nation:

—But do you know what a nation means? says John Wyse.

—Yes, says Bloom.

—What is it? says John Wyse.

—A nation? says Bloom. A nation is the same people living in the same place.

—By God, then, says Ned, laughing, if that's so I'm a nation for I'm living in the same place for the past five years.

So of course everyone had the laugh at Bloom and says he, trying to muck out of it:

—Or also living in different places.

—That covers my case, says Joe.

—What is your nation, if I may ask? says the citizen.

—Ireland, says Bloom. I was born here. Ireland.

The citizen said nothing only cleared the spit out of his gullet and, gob, he spat a Red bank oyster out of him right in the corner. (*Ulysses* 12.1419–1433)

The definition of nationhood for Bloom is not dependent on internal homogeneity so much as territorial integrity. Bloom can therefore assert that he is Irish. Proleptically naming Ireland a nation, Bloom defines it as a unified territory in contrast to the citizen's efforts to define nationality in terms of race and language.

Bloom's territorial definition is followed by an ekphrasis of an "ancient Irish facecloth" that contains a geographical catalogue of Ireland, including the locations of ancient sites from all over the island (*Ulysses* 12.1438–1464). The ekphrastic assertion of the ancient territorial integrity of Ireland does not, however, remain unchallenged. In fact, Bloom problematizes the unity of Ireland by adding after the ekphrasis that in addition to his Irishness, he is also not Irish: "And I belong to a race too, says Bloom, that is hated and persecuted. Also now. This very moment. This very instant" (*Ulysses* 12.1467–1468). Bloom is both Irish and not Irish, as Aeneas is both Italian and not Italian. Bloom offers the possibility of constructing a contested unity out of hybridity and multiplicity, and the episode itself bears out the possibility of such a construction by placing such diverse characters as Bloom and the citizen within the same real community in Dublin. Both are in some way out of place, but both also constitute the Irish nation by virtue of geographical unity awaiting political sovereignty. Both the *Aeneid* and *Ulysses* imagine a territorial unity and then problematize that unity by raising questions of immigration and racial continuity.

Civil War and Political Identity

One of the most basic characteristics of territorial states is that, however new the political sovereignty of the state, they imagine the territory as an ancient and natural whole. New nation-states invent a history in which the nation is permanent, and it is only the political state that is a recent invention (Anderson 2006, 11–12). As a consequence of this permanence, nationalists often recast ancient

conflicts between clearly distinguished groups as civil wars (Anderson 2006, 199–200). For nationalists, any war between groups within a given geographical space is a civil war. No matter how recent the rise of a territorial state, that state imagines its territory as a natural whole that at times in the past has been tragically divided by civil strife. By lamenting past conflicts as fratricidal wars, territorial states reassure themselves that the territory as it is presently imagined has always already been inhabited by fellow countrymen.¹⁴

What makes fratricide reassuring is not only that it invents fraternity, but also that it gives nationalist meaning to death. Nationalism transforms “fatality into continuity, contingency into meaning” (Anderson 2006, 11). It draws emotional power from death and disaster. Nothing unifies national sentiment like a national catastrophe. Projections of civil war onto the past are doubly powerful because they claim the deaths on both sides of ancient conflicts for the nation. Anderson’s primary example of this is the nineteenth-century French nationalist historian Jules Michelet, whose national heroes “were those whose sacrifices, throughout History, made possible the rupture of 1789 and the selfconscious appearance of the French nation, even when these sacrifices were not understood as such by the victims” (Anderson 2006, 198). Nationalist history rewrites past wars as civil wars not only as a projection of unity, but as a way of claiming death as sacrifice for the nation. Another example of this phenomenon is Latin American *indigenismo* (Anderson 2006, 198–199). This cultural movement claims for modern Latin American nations the “sacrifices” made by pre-conquest civilizations, giving the nation the valuable purpose of overcoming great loss. In a manner analogous to the way *indigenismo* appropriates for Latin American anti-colonial nationalisms the deaths of the victims of European colonization, the Irish revivalist nationalists, largely Anglo-Irish, were descendants of British colonists who constructed and appropriated an Irish past to use as nationalist resistance. Such an appropriation of a native past by the descendants of colonists is also how the *Aeneid* appropriates the deaths of ancient Italians for Rome.¹⁵ The poem presents the deaths of ancient Italians as terrible losses, and then gives meaning to the individual deaths through the continuity of the Italian community. It activates the emotional power of resistance to Roman conquest as a way of constructing Roman identity. It is the need to overcome death that gives purpose to collective identification. The *Aeneid* builds Roman identity around the tragedy of ancient civil war.

The legend of Aeneas did not always represent the Latin War as a civil war.¹⁶ Other versions of the story have no trouble presenting the Trojan ancestors of Rome as foreigners in Italy. Pyrrhus of Epirus, for example, in one of the earliest documented occurrences of the legend of Rome’s Trojan origins, attempted to gain allies among the Greeks in Italy by announcing that “he would recreate the

Achaean victory at Troy by subduing the colonists of Troy.”¹⁷ Pyrrhus uses the legend of the Trojan origins of Rome to divide Rome from the other Italians. Early literary versions of the story also use the legend to emphasize the Romans’ unique position among Italians. One early literary account of the legend, for example, is from Cato’s *Origines*.¹⁸ In this version of the story, Aeneas and the Trojans fight alone against the allied Latins and Rutulians, and while Cato does have Aeneas marry Latinus’s daughter Lavinia, he does not suggest that this new familial tie makes the war a civil war. Rather, for Cato, Aeneas and the Trojans are colonists who attempt to make alliances with the native peoples, but having failed, defend themselves and conquer the Italians. The marriage makes both parties the ancestors of the Romans, but the war is between different states. Cato’s account of the war as a foreign war makes sense, since for Cato, in the first half of the second century, the relation between Rome and Italy was not yet a cultural union, but still a Roman conquest.

By Virgil’s time, the dominant version of the legend of Aeneas and his war in Italy had changed a little from Cato’s story. Livy tells the story that Aeneas allied with the Latins and that together they fought the Rutulians.¹⁹ Instead of Cato’s account, in which the Trojans arrive in Italy and fight everybody they find there, the later story has Aeneas finding allies among the Italians. The alliance between Trojans and Latins helps to erase some of the conflict between the ancient peoples that would make up Rome. Virgil goes much further in his changes to the legend of Aeneas than Livy’s small step. His radical reinterpretation of the legend does not minimize the conflict, but makes it into a tragic civil war. The *Aeneid* goes back to the earlier dominant version of the legend in which the Trojans fight the allied Latins and Rutulians. Unlike Cato, however, Virgil does not allow this to make the Trojans purely colonists. Instead, the *Aeneid* constructs relationships between the Trojans and their enemies among the Italians so that the conflict becomes fratricidal.

In addition to the ancestral ties that link the Trojans to their Italian enemies, the poem represents the final duel between Aeneas and Turnus as a fratricidal one. Philip Hardie points out that, while in many ways the two are opposites, they are also very much alike (Hardie 1993, 22–23). Hardie cites in particular an allusion to Ennius that links Aeneas and Turnus to Romulus and Remus (Hardie 1993, 23). During the duel, a simile links the spectators to heifers watching two bulls fight: “stat pecus omne metu mutum, mussantque iuvencae / quis nemori imperitet” (“The whole herd stands silent with fear, and the heifers discuss who will rule the wood”; *Aeneid* 12.718–719). Similarly, when in Ennius the crowd watches Romulus and Remus, “omnibus cura viris uter esset induperator” (“It concerned all men which of the two would be ruler”; *Annales* 78 Skutsch). The connection between

Aeneas and Turnus and Romulus and Remus emphasizes the fratricidal nature of the conflict between the Trojans and Italians.

While other sources describe Aeneas's war against the Italians as a war between foreigners, the *Aeneid* represents it as a fratricidal one. Conversely, in the representation of Actium on the shield, the poem turns a civil and familial war into a foreign one. While Virgil uses an allusion to Romulus and Remus to make Aeneas's killing of Turnus a fratricide, the poem never directly confronts the fratricide of Romulus. In book 1, in fact, Jupiter promises that "Remo cum fratre Quirinus / iura dabunt" ("Romulus will issue laws with his brother Remus"; *Aeneid* 1.292–293). The *Aeneid* makes foreign wars civil and civil wars foreign, at times inventing and at times erasing fratricide. The fresh trauma of the war between Octavian and Antony meets with the *Aeneid*'s reassurance that at Actium Antony was a foreigner. The poem also reassuringly overwrites and heals the fratricide of Romulus, in its own way very real and immediate as a mythical analogue of the recent civil wars.²⁰ These reassurances erase internal division and unite Romans. The projection of civil war and fratricide onto the ancient past of Aeneas's war is similarly reassuring, paradoxically uniting the Trojans and Italians by making their divisions internal. The rearranging of civil and foreign wars is not a simple displacement of recent division into a safely distant past. Rather there are two different strategies at work, one erasing fratricide and the other inventing fratricide, and each in its own way reassuringly constructs a collective, fraternal identity. Furthermore, while these two processes may seem unique to Rome or even to Virgil, Anderson's argument shows that they are in fact typical phenomena in the newly emerging collective identities of territorial states (Anderson 2006, 201).

The memory and forgetting of ancient conquest is also a feature of Irish revivalist nationalism. In "Cyclops," the citizen wears trophies of ancient Irish heroes and heroines (*Ulysses* 12.175–199). The first of the ancient heroes are "Cuchulin, Conn of the hundred battles, Niall of the nine hostages, Brian of Kincora, the ardri Malachi, Art MacMurragh," and "Shane O'Neill" (*Ulysses* 12.176–178). All of these are ancient military heroes and kings who in some way united Ireland. Conn of the hundred battles, for example, was the legendary king of Ireland in the second century CE who led the armies of Connacht to victory over Leinster and Munster, and then, after a fourteen-year war that divided Ireland between Conn and Mog Meadath, killed Mog and united all of Ireland for the first time (Gifford 1989, ad loc.). The "nine hostages" of Niall were not foreigners, but hostages from petty kings of Ireland to guarantee internal peace (Gifford 1989, ad loc.). The heroes of Ireland whose sacrifices the revivalists commemorate as making possible the re-emergence of Ireland in the twentieth century were conquerors of Ireland and rivals of other Irish kings. The Revival, like the *Aeneid*, overwrites the division and

conquest of the past by commemorating their deaths as tragic sacrifices and losses. When the citizen rails against Irishmen who would aid in the execution of other Irishmen, complaining that they “would hang their own fathers” (*Ulysses* 12.442), he sets off a debate about capital punishment in which he hails as heroes executed men like Robert Emmet (“Robert Emmett and die for your country”; *Ulysses* 12.499–500). He finishes his point with a toast to “the memory of the dead” (*Ulysses* 12.519). The citizen, like the *Aeneid*, draws on an ancient past of internal conflict and a history of proleptically patriotic death to inspire emerging national unity.

Nationalism, as Anderson makes clear, is a form of mourning.²¹ Anderson begins his analysis of the cultural roots of nationalism with the point that “No more arresting emblems of the modern culture of nationalism exist than cenotaphs and tombs of Unknown Soldiers” (Anderson 2006, 9). He concludes the revised, second edition of *Imagined Communities* with the observation that “deaths structure the nation’s biography” and that the nation, in narrating its biography, “snatches, against the going mortality rate, exemplary suicides, poignant martyrdoms, assassinations, executions, wars, and holocausts” (Anderson 2006, 205–206). In the Irish revivalism represented in “Cyclops,” the unity of the nation emerges as collective mourning for exemplary death. Similarly, in the *Aeneid* the unity of Italy grows from the exemplary deaths of the heroes and heroines of antiquity.

The Death of Lausus

The idea of the reassurance of fratricide helps to explain not only the fratricidal aspect of the conflict between Aeneas and Turnus but also some of the subtler ways in which the *Aeneid* adapts the legend of Aeneas to its purposes. One of the subtle ways in which Virgil alters the legend of Aeneas to emphasize the unnatural division of the Latin War is through the story of Mezentius.²² According to Cato, Mezentius is an Etruscan king who offers his help to the Rutulians.²³ Virgil’s version of the story is that Mezentius is a terrible Etruscan tyrant whose people have rebelled against him. He appeals to Turnus for aid in fighting his own people, and the Etruscans turn to Aeneas (*Aeneid* 8.478–496). Not only are the Trojans Italian, but there are also people from the same Etruscan community fighting on opposite sides of the war. Although the Etruscan rebellion against Mezentius and his son Lausus is not precisely a civil war, since it appears that the Etruscans are unified in their defiance of the king, nevertheless the device of pitting Mezentius and Lausus against their own people in the larger war between Italians heightens the sense that the Latin War divides peoples who should naturally be united.²⁴

The story of Mezentius and Lausus in the *Aeneid* uses the issue of mourning personal loss in war to discuss political identity. When Aeneas kills Lausus and Mezentius sees the corpse of his son, his speech intertwines his personal grief with reflections on the wrong of civil war and the importance of proper collective identification. Mezentius's reflections are especially striking since they represent a dramatic transformation of character.²⁵ The tyrant has been a terrible villain, but he now elicits deep sympathy. The transformation occurs not only because Mezentius is a father mourning a dead son, but also because the loss of Lausus causes Mezentius to realize his political mistakes:

heu, nunc misero mihi demum
exsilium²⁶ infelix, nunc alte vulnus adactum!
idem ego, nate, tuum maculavi crimine nomen,
pulsus ob invidiam solio sceptrisque paternis.
debueram patriae poenas odiisque meorum:
omnis per mortis animam sontem ipse dedissem!

Aeneid 10.849–854

Alas, now finally there is unhappy exile for wretched me, now the wound has been driven deep! I myself, son, have sullied your name with crime, driven from the throne and paternal scepter on account of envy. I owed penalties to my country and the hatred of my people: I should have given up my guilty soul through every kind of death!

Mezentius regrets not only the death of his son, but also the political choices that led to war against his own people. The disruption of familial continuity in the death of Lausus drives home for Mezentius the importance of connection with a collective political entity. The death of Lausus is a personal loss, but it reinforces an emotionally charged political identity.

Mezentius is not the only character in the *Aeneid* to grieve for Lausus. Remarkably, Aeneas also mourns the death of his enemy. Aeneas's mourning is especially striking because, like Mezentius's speech over the death of Lausus, it represents a reversal of his previous attitude. When he kills Lausus, Aeneas is in the grip of rage over the death of Pallas. When the Italian soldier Magus supplicates Aeneas by invoking Anchises and Iulus (*Aeneid* 10.524–525), Aeneas mercilessly kills him. When he kills Tarquitus, Aeneas gloats "inimico pectore" ("with an inimical heart"; *Aeneid* 10.555) that Tarquitus will lie where he is and not return home for burial. The dying Lausus, however, causes Aeneas to pause. No longer exulting in the death of his enemies, Aeneas actually mourns for Lausus:

at vero ut vultum vidit morientis et ora,
ora modis Anchisiades pallentia miris,
ingemuit miserans graviter dextramque tetendit,
et mentem patriae subiit pietatis imago.

Aeneid 10.821–824

But indeed when he saw the face and the expression of the dying boy, a face astonishingly pale, the son of Anchises, pitying him, groaned heavily and extended his right hand, and the image of his devotion for his father came into his mind.

Aeneas's mourning for Lausus identifies the Latin War with civil war by emphasizing the similarities between the two sides. What ends Aeneas's uncontrollable rage is the idea that Lausus has displayed the particularly Roman virtue of *pietas*.²⁷ When he addresses the dead Lausus, Aeneas refers to himself as *pius Aeneas* (*Aeneid* 10.826), pointing out that he too is marked by *pietas*. Aeneas recognizes his own best quality in his enemy. The name *Anchisiades* further identifies Aeneas with Lausus since it alludes to Aeneas's devotion to his own father (Johnson 1976, 72–73; Clausen 2002, 207; Reed 2007, 182). Unlike Magus, who merely supplicates Aeneas by mentioning Anchises and Iulus, Lausus shows Aeneas through his actions that he, like Aeneas, is marked by *pietas*.

Moreover, Lausus's *pietas* not only reflects his devotion to his father, but also carries political significance.²⁸ Indeed, it would be a mistake to divorce the idea of familial *pietas* in the *Aeneid* from its political context. When Mezentius mourns Lausus he combines his fatherly grief with his political regret, and both the familial and the political identification are present in the idea of *pietas*. Lausus's sacrifice for his father is also a political act. *Pietas* is a strongly Roman characteristic, and Lausus acts in accordance with his Italian character when he sacrifices himself for his father. Even fighting against his own people, Lausus's filial devotion embodies a national characteristic and is therefore a paradoxically patriotic act. The *pietas* that Lausus and Aeneas share makes Lausus's death not a glorious victory, but a sad loss for Aeneas and for the future of Italy.

The realization that Lausus shares his virtue causes Aeneas to treat him not as an enemy, but as a fallen comrade. The grief Aeneas expresses at the death of Lausus in fact closely resembles his lament for Pallas (Conte 1986, 176; Reed 2007, 36). Aeneas addresses Lausus:

“quid tibi nunc, miserande puer, pro laudibus istis,
quid pius Aeneas tanta dabit indole dignum?”

arma, quibus laetatus, habe tua; teque parentum
manibus et cineri, si qua est ea cura, remitto.
hoc tamen infelix miseram solabere mortem:
Aeneae magni dextra cadis.” increpat ultro
cunctantis socios et terra sublevat ipsum
sanguine turpantem comptos de more capillos.

Aeneid 10.825–832

“What now, pitiable boy, what thing worthy of such a nature will dutiful Aeneas give you for those praiseworthy deeds? Keep your arms, in which you rejoiced; and, if there is any consolation in this, I send you back to the shades and the ashes of your ancestors. Unfortunate, you will ease wretched death with this: You fall by the right hand of great Aeneas.” He, of his own accord, reproves the companions holding back and lifts up from the ground Lausus, who was befouling with blood the artfully arranged hair.

Aeneas begins by calling Lausus *miserande puer*, an address he uses in only one other instance (as Conte and others point out)—in his lament for Pallas (Otis 1964, 303; Tracy 1975; Conte 1986, 176; Reed 2007, 36–40). The scene of Aeneas’s mourning for Pallas (*Aeneid* 11.39–67) closely parallels the scene depicting Lausus’s death, down to the detail of lifting up the corpse, although it should be noted that Aeneas lifts the corpse of Lausus himself but merely orders that Pallas’s corpse be lifted (*Aeneid* 11.59–60). The act that began Aeneas’s rampage was Turnus killing Pallas and taking his belt (*Aeneid* 10.490–500), and Aeneas ends his rage by refusing to take Lausus’s arms. Turnus, having killed a noble young man, continues (with tragic consequences) to act as an enemy. Aeneas, on the other hand, having killed a similarly virtuous youth, stops acting as an enemy and instead acts as a comrade. He does not merely return the corpse of his enemy for burial, but he lifts the body himself, criticizing Lausus’s companions for their failure (*Aeneid* 10.830–832). Because Lausus is a double of Pallas, his death amounts to a personal loss for Aeneas. When Aeneas grieves for Lausus, he acts as if he had lost a friend, not killed an enemy.

The link between Lausus and Pallas demonstrates multiple ways in which the *Aeneid* constructs ancient Italian unity through civil war. First, though neither Pallas nor Lausus is a Trojan, Aeneas grieves deeply for them both. There is an emotional bond between Aeneas and the peoples of Italy. Second, the doubling of Pallas in Lausus emphasizes the commonalities among the foes in this war. Moreover, through the figures of Lausus and Pallas, the emotional power of personal loss attaches itself to collective political identity. When Mezentius mourns for

Lausus he joins his personal grief with his loss of political identification. The death of Pallas, too, links personal loss with political identification. Aeneas closes his lament for Pallas, “ei mihi, quantum / praesidium, Ausonia, et quantum tu perdis, Iule!” (“Alas for me, how great a defense you are losing, Ausonia, and you too, Iulus!”; *Aeneid* 11.57–58). Aeneas combines the personal, familial loss with the idea that the death of Pallas is also a loss for Italy. The poem borrows the emotional power of personal grief and applies it to the Italian community.

The purest example of a figure who combines personal grief with political identity is also the only other character addressed as *miserande puer*. This expression occurs in the *Aeneid* for the first time in Anchises’s words to Marcellus (*Aeneid* 6.882; Tracy 1975). The latter, Augustus’s nephew and heir, is the quintessential Roman hero, who appears at the end of the so-called parade of heroes.²⁹ Immediately before this parade, Anchises seems to conclude his praise of future Roman heroes with a general statement on Roman character (*Aeneid* 6.847–853). The famous description of the collective traits and talents of Romans would be a fitting end to a list of figures who will embody that character. There are still, however, two figures remaining—the Marcelli. These two addenda to the list stand out, by virtue of their position after Anchises’s summary of Roman identity, as particularly full representations of that identity. The first Marcellus serves Italy well in defeating the foreign Gauls and Carthaginians but acts here primarily as a prelude to the final hero. Anchises introduces the second Marcellus with the words, “o gnate, ingentem luctum ne quaere tuorum” (“Son, do not ask about the great grief of your people”; *Aeneid* 6.868) and continues to describe him as the best of Roman heroes:

nec puer Iliaca quisquam de gente Latinos
in tantum spe tollet avos, nec Romula quondam
ullo se tantum tellus iactabit alumno.
heu pietas, heu prisca fides invictaque bello
dextera! Non illi se quisquam impune tulisset
obvius armato, seu cum pedes iret in hostem
seu spumantis equi foderet calcaribus armos.
heu, miderande puer, si qua fata aspera rumpas!³⁰
tu Marcellus eris.

Aeneid 6.875–883

No boy of the Trojan race will raise his Latin ancestors to such a height in hope, nor will the land of Romulus ever take such pride in any child. Alas for his piety, alas for his old-fashioned faith and his right hand unbeaten in

war! No one would have come to meet him, armed, without harm, whether he attacked the enemy going on foot or dug at the sides of a foaming horse with spurs. Alas, pitiable boy, if only somehow you could break through harsh fate! You will be Marcellus.

Anchises describes Marcellus as the ultimate Roman.³¹ He serves as a powerful symbol of what it means to be Roman not because of his actions, but by virtue of his untimely death, which is both a great loss for Rome and a tragedy that helps constitute Roman collective identity. Marcellus is also the next major intertext between the *Aeneid* and *Ulysses*. In the next chapter, I will show Joyce using Virgil's Marcellus not to separate his own vision of Ireland from that of the revivalists, but also to appropriate the Virgilian strategy of using exemplary death to construct national identity.

The well-known verbal parallel, *miserande puer*, draws attention to thematic connections between Marcellus and Pallas and Lausus (Otis 1964, 303; Tracy 1975; Reed 2007, 36–40). Like Marcellus and Pallas, Lausus is a promising young man who dies before his potential can be fulfilled or disappointed. Even though Lausus is not himself Roman, his people are ancestors of Rome and his virtues are Roman virtues. Lausus's Etruscans also have an important place in Roman heritage. Though the Etruscan kings, like Mezentius, are sometimes tyrannical, they are nevertheless Roman ancestors. Even Mezentius is at least partially redeemed by his grief at the death of his son, and the family is redeemed by Lausus's own virtue. Though they fight against Aeneas, the Etruscans, as Italians, will one day be Romans. Thus the death of the promising young Lausus is a loss for Aeneas and for Rome.

The death of Lausus is an example of the reassurance of fratricide. When Aeneas notes Lausus's *pietas* and then calls himself *pius*, he sets Lausus up as a kind of double or brother. When Aeneas kills Lausus, he mourns the loss as if Lausus had been one of his own. Moreover, as Mezentius's mourning for Lausus causes him to recall his duty to his people, so also does Aeneas's mourning cause him to recall *pietas*—duty to family and to the Roman future. Mourning the death of Lausus links familial and political connection. Aeneas's grief for Lausus, as if the two were allies and not enemies, reflects the ultimate fusing of Trojan and Italian identities into a constructed Roman identity. By mourning the death of Lausus, the *Aeneid* reassuringly unites Trojans and Italians as ancestors of Rome.

In Virgil's text, the death of Lausus and Aeneas's mourning create the conditions for the future emergence of Rome.³² The *Aeneid* can claim Lausus as a sacrifice for Rome because Lausus, as an Italian, is retroactively Roman. Even though the ancient Italians did not identify themselves as Roman, the *Aeneid* recognizes them

as such because it imagines that the association of Rome with Italy is natural and timeless. Lausus is thus a victim of one of the ancient civil and fratricidal wars that founded Rome. There is something sinister in this projection of Roman Italy onto the ancient past. As in the case of Anglo-Irish revivalism, an ideology that aligns English-speaking intellectuals with indigenous culture against English imperialism, the move of mourning the death of Lausus appropriates for Rome something that does not belong to it. Aeneas kills Lausus, who was fighting with Turnus to keep the Trojans from joining the Italian peoples, and then he mourns in a way that appropriates the loss for his own Roman future. While it is true that Roman culture is Italian, it is also true that historically many Italians died precisely because they did not want to be Roman. The *Aeneid*, at the same time as it recognizes those deaths as untimely and even tragic, uses the emotional power of mourning for Italian deaths to appropriate a collective Italian identity for Rome.

Conclusion

The collective identification that mourning the loss of Marcellus and Lausus inspires is not simple patriotism or support for the Augustan regime. The ideology of Italian unification, while it was an important base of power for Augustus, is deeper than party politics. Anderson points out:

It is surely too easy to attribute these reassuring ancient fratricides simply to the icy calculations of state functionaries. At another level they reflect a deep reshaping of the imagination of which the state was barely conscious, and over which it had, and still has, only exiguous control. (Anderson 2006, 201)

It is natural for Virgil to imagine Aeneas's war as a civil war, but only because a profound shift in the character of Roman identity has naturalized the image. Augustus may have been a brilliant politician, but he did not simply invent Italian territorial identity. His political reforms ratified and organized an ideology that had been developing in Italy for more than a hundred years. Nor was Augustus merely an instrument of inevitable historical progress. Had Antony and Cleopatra been victorious at Actium, Italy and the Roman Empire would have taken an entirely different direction. Augustus participated both actively and passively in constructing a new sort of Roman identity. The ideology of unified Italy, like nationalism, is not simply a political agenda or an instinctive belief. It is a construction of identity that mixes conscious action with unconscious motivation. The *Aeneid* ideologically constructs Roman identity through ancient Italian roots.

This does not mean that Virgil was merely reflecting a cultural transformation: the *Aeneid* works through the transformation of Roman identity in the Augustan period, playing its part in the construction of an ideology that makes sense of the Roman person's place in the world.

Rome's geographical association with the Italian peninsula and its natural borders of the sea and the Alps, which form permanent spatial markers, make it easy to imagine that no other geographical identity could have been possible for Augustan Rome. In fact, the bounded geographical space of Italy is not natural, permanent, or essential, but a social construction that enables the inhabitants of Italy to imagine a community based on geography. As is characteristic of all such territorially defined sovereignties, Augustan Rome imagines the new territorial integrity of the state to be permanent, projecting it onto the ancient past and into the limitless future. It is this projection that makes the Latin War in the *Aeneid* a civil war, and the consequent death of Roman heroes constructs the ideal of Roman identity as pure and tragic loss. The fratricidal war in the second half of the poem overwrites the historical Roman conquest of Italy and appropriates ancient enemies of Rome as ancestral Roman heroes.

The reassurance of fratricide in the *Aeneid* is a way of working through the semicolonial relationship between Rome and Italy, as Italy is both a conquered province and the imperial capital. This semicoloniality is different from that of Ireland, which although long Anglicized and incorporated in to the United Kingdom, never included the imperial capital and ultimately gained independence from the empire. Nevertheless, the efforts of *Ulysses* to incorporate as Irish the deeply divided peoples of Ireland, including nationalist Catholics like Stephen, militants like the citizen, Protestant unionists like Bloom's father-in-law Tweedy, and cultural outsiders like Bloom himself, display a similar effort to unify the various peoples inhabiting a bounded space—a space soon to be divided by civil war. In the *Aeneid*, *Ulysses* finds a model of a problematic and ambivalent nationalism, hesitating between unity and division, between the horror of violence and the hope of peace, and ultimately constructing out of death, loss, and division a powerful new poetic and political identity.

Joyce's Rudy and Virgil's Marcellus

In the previous chapters, I argued that in *Ulysses* Joyce negotiates and articulates his relationship to Irish nationalist politics through allusion to the *Aeneid*, using in particular Joyce's sustained parallel between the citizen in the "Cyclops" episode and Virgil's Cacus of *Aeneid* 8. Joyce's reception of *Aeneid* 8 suggests a nationalist rather than imperialist reading of the *Aeneid*, emphasizing the ways in which the *Aeneid*, like the Irish revivalist nationalists, constructs and appropriates the emotional power of ancient injustice to engender collective nationalist identification. In this chapter, I will elaborate on Joyce's political use of Virgil, this time through a parallel between *Aeneid* 6 and the "Circe" episode of *Ulysses*. At the end of the episode, an apparition of Leopold Bloom's dead son, Rudy, appears in the street. The ghost is not the infant Rudy, who died when he was eleven days old, but an older child. He is a ghost not of what was, but of what might have been. I will argue that the appearance of Rudy's ghost alludes to the appearance of the ghost of Marcellus at the end of the sixth book of Virgil's *Aeneid*. In *Aeneid* 6, Aeneas's dead father, Anchises, shows him the spirits of their descendants, the future heroes of Rome, the last of whom is Marcellus. Like Rudy, Marcellus is a ghost of what might have been. After more than a century of civil war, Augustus's autocratic regime had in Virgil's day finally brought peace to Rome. With the death of Augustus's nephew and heir, however, the uncertainty of the line of succession threatened more violence. Marcellus had embodied the hope of a smooth succession and a prosperous future, and his ghost serves as a reminder of the uncertainty of the Roman Empire's future. The allusion to Marcellus gives Rudy's ghost a political character. He represents not only the happiness that might have been for Bloom's family, but also, on a broadly public scale, the political aspirations of the country. Through his association with Marcellus, Rudy's ghost haunts the optimism of the revolutionary moment in Ireland with the specter of future violence.

Nothing in *Ulysses* is straightforward, including especially its intertextuality. For any given chapter or passage, there are many models and sources. While

chapter 15, "Circe," does indeed bear traces of the story of Odysseus and Circe in the *Odyssey*, scholars have identified many other influences as well. Just as Odysseus prolongs his journey by engaging in an extended sexual relationship with Circe, Bloom stays away from home in the brothel of Bella Cohen. In addition, pigs feature prominently in both episodes (Smith 2002). Circe turns Odysseus's men into pigs, and Eric Smith notes "the 'Circe' episode contains well more than five times as many references to the pig as any other chapter in the novel" (Smith 2002, 136). On the other hand, scholars have argued that Joyce also found important models for "Circe" in Shakespeare, Apollinaire, Meredith, and Ponchielli (Dunphy 1983; Edwards 1950; Gordon 1999; Osteen 1998). Gifford identifies Flaubert, Goethe, Hauptmann, Ibsen, Strindberg, Sacher-Masoch, and Krafft-Ebing (Gifford 1989, 452). Ellmann notes the influence of Ovid, Dante, Yeats, Ariosto, and Vico (Ellmann 1972, 141). As for Latin authors, R. J. Schork finds in "Circe" allusions to Suetonius, Livy, Ovid, the *Priapea*, Justinian, Catullus, Petronius, and Plautus.¹ These lists are just the tip of the iceberg. "Circe" is one of the most richly allusive chapters in the novel. Strangely absent from the scholarly lists, however, is Virgil. "Circe" draws on Virgil in addition to its many other sources, and specifically it draws on Virgil's Marcellus as a model for Rudy. Marcellus was the heir to the Roman Empire, and so his death was a political event as well as a personal tragedy for his family. By linking Marcellus to Rudy, "Circe" also joins the uncertain future of the Bloom family with the politically uncertain future of Ireland.

Joyce and *Aeneid* 6

Before specifically addressing the allusion to Marcellus, it will be useful to elaborate on Joyce's other uses of *Aeneid* 6 as well as some general correspondences between that book and "Circe."² Although the allusion to *Aeneid* 6 in "Circe" has apparently escaped notice, elsewhere Joyce alludes extensively to Aeneas's journey through the underworld. Predictably, chapter six of *Ulysses*, the "Hades" episode, draws on Virgil's description of the world of the dead. Schork catalogues a long list of parallels (Schork 1997, 128–131), and while some of his suggestions are questionable, many are persuasive. First, as the men in the funeral procession in "Hades" approach the cemetery, they see some statues:

Crowded on the spit of land silent shapes appeared, white, sorrowful, holding out calm hands, knelt in grief, pointing. Fragments of shapes, hewn. In white silence: appealing. (*Ulysses* 6.459–461; quoted in Schork 1997, 128)

These statues seem to be ghosts, but more than the shades that gather at the edge of the world in *Odyssey* II, they resemble the crowds of the dead waiting to cross the river in the *Aeneid*:

stant orantes primi transmittere cursum
tendebantque manus ripae ulterioris amore.

Aeneid 6.313–314;

quoted in Schork 1997, 128

They were standing, begging to cross the river first and stretching out their hands with yearning for the far bank.

There may not be direct verbal echoes, but the way into the cemetery resembles the entrance to Virgil's underworld. The exit from the cemetery is similarly Virgilian, as the "gates glimmered" (*Ulysses* 6.995). The glimmer of the gates reminds Schork of the famous ivory gate through which Aeneas exits the underworld (Schork 1997, 129). At the end of *Aeneid* 6, Virgil describes the two ways out of the world of the dead:

Sunt geminae Somni portae, quarum altera fertur
cornea, qua ueris facilis datur exitus umbris,
altera candenti perfecta nitens elephanto,
sed falsa ad caelum mittunt insomnia Manes.

Aeneid 6.893–896

There are twin gates of Sleep, one of which is said to be horn, by which easy exit is given to true shades, the other, shining, made of white ivory, but the spirits send false dreams to the upper air.

Virgil takes the story of the gates of horn and ivory from Homer's *Odyssey* (19.562–567), as Penelope explains to the disguised Odysseus that she fears her dream of her husband's return may be false. Penelope's description of the ivory gate, however, makes no reference to shining or glimmering:

δοιαί γάρ τε πύλαι ἀμενηνῶν εἰσὶν ὀνείρων·
αἱ μὲν γὰρ κεράεσσι τετεύχεται, αἱ δ' ἐλέφαντι.
τῶν οἱ μὲν κ' ἔλθωσι διὰ πριστοῦ ἐλέφαντος,
οἳ ῥ' ἐλεφαίρονται, ἔπε' ἀκράαντα φέροντες·

Odyssey 19.562–565

There are two gates of fleeting dreams, for one was made with horn, and the other with ivory. Those dreams that come through sawn ivory deceive, bearing fruitless words.

Although the gates of sleep are present in both Virgil and Homer, Joyce's allusion picks up the "glimmer" ("candenti . . . nitens elephanto"; *Aeneid* 6.895) from *Aeneid* 6 rather than *Odyssey* 19. Moreover, immediately following the sentence in which the gates glimmer, Bloom thinks, "Back to the world again. Enough of this place" (*Ulysses* 6.995–996), suggesting that the gates are an exit from the underworld to the world of the living (and thereby alluding to the gates' function in the *Aeneid* but not the *Odyssey*).³

There are even more allusions to *Aeneid* 6 to be found in *Finnegans Wake*. Although these allusions do not directly demonstrate a connection between *Aeneid* 6 and "Circe," like the allusions to *Aeneid* 6 in "Hades," they help to elucidate Joyce's interest in Aeneas's journey through the underworld. The *Wake* first alludes to *Aeneid* 6 during a debate between "Justius" and "Mercius." The two qualities of justice and mercy are part of a series of oppositions roughly paralleling the twin brothers Shaun, who is dull and conformist, and Shem, who is wild and creative (Campbell 1993, 137). Justius, in the midst of a long speech condemning Shem, makes the accusation, "impolitely you encored (Airish and nawboggaleesh!) those hornmade ivory dreams you reved of the Ruth you called your companionate" (*Finnegans Wake* 192.26–28; quoted in Schork 1997, 129). The "hornmade ivory dreams" allude to Aeneas's exit from the underworld. Earlier, in Shem and Shaun's question-and-answer session of book 1, chapter 6, the novel also alludes to the doves, sent by Venus, that guide Aeneas through the woods to the golden bough:

Bright pigeons all over the whirld will fly with mistletoe message round their loveribboned necks and crumb of my cake for each chasta dieva.
(*Finnegans Wake* 147.22–24; quoted in Schork 1997, 130)

In the *Aeneid* Venus's doves lead Aeneas to the golden bough (*Aeneid* 6.190–204), which the poem likens to mistletoe (*Aeneid* 6.205–209; Austin 1986, ad 205), and here they are pigeons with a "mistletoe message." Lastly and most explicitly, *Finnegans Wake* alludes to a passage in which Anchises pleads with future Romans to remember their national role:

tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento
(hae tibi erunt artes), pacique imponere morem,
parcere subiectis et debellare superbos.

Aeneid 6.847–853; quoted in Schork 1997, 131

You, Roman, remember to rule peoples with authority, these will be your arts, to impose the custom for peace, to spare the conquered and battle down the arrogant.

During the question-and-answer session, Shaun refers to Anchises's speech:

I need not anthropologise for any obintentional (I must here correct all that school of neoitalian or paleoparisien schola of tinkers and spanglers who say I'm wrong *parcequeue* out of revolscian from romanitis I want to be) down-trodding on my foes. (*Finnegans Wake* 151.9–11)

Later on, as Shaun revisits in book 3 the events of book 1,⁴ he asserts, "I was parcifful of my subject but in street wauks that are darkest I debelledem superb" (*Finnegans Wake* 545.28–29), again recalling Anchises's plea, "parcere subiectis et debellare superbos" ("to spare the conquered and battle down the arrogant"; *Aeneid* 6.853; quoted in Schork 1997, 131). These few examples (and Schork finds even more) show Joyce's interest in *Aeneid* 6 in general and in the journey through the underworld in particular.

In *Ulysses* the episode that fulfills a function most closely resembling that of *Aeneid* 6 is not "Hades" but "Circe." Both *Aeneid* 6 and "Circe" mark turning points in their respective narratives. In the *Aeneid*, book 6 makes the transition between Aeneas's search for a new home and his effort to carve out a place for his people in Italy.⁵ In book 6, Aeneas, after much striving, finally arrives in Italy and begins to discover what is involved, no longer in reaching, but now in making a new home. Aeneas stops looking to his Trojan past and starts to focus on his Italian future, and at the beginning of book 7 he arrives at his future home in Latium.

In *Ulysses*, "Circe" is also a transitional episode (Ellmann 1959, 381; Kenner 1987, 127). The chapter is the turning point between Bloom's outward journey and his return home, as well as a turning point in the relationship between Bloom and Stephen. It is in this episode that Bloom, like Aeneas, stops focusing on the past and starts looking (with unwarranted optimism) to the future. Aeneas flees a home destroyed by fire, and Bloom's home has also been destroyed by fire (in a metaphorical sense): during the day his wife, Molly, has been sleeping with her manager ("Blazes" Boylan). Until "Circe," Bloom, like Aeneas, is focused on the past and on the destruction of his home, but in "Circe" he begins to look toward a new home. The "new Bloomusalem in the Nova Hibernia of the future" (*Ulysses* 15.1544–1545) will have its first foundation in the new relationship between Bloom and Stephen (Ellmann 1972, 149–150). The death of Rudy has torn apart Bloom's household, but in "Circe" he finds a new son in Stephen. When Private Carr knocks Stephen unconscious (*Ulysses* 15.4747–4750), Stephen undergoes a symbolic death

(the undertaker Corny Kelleher comes to him with a death wreath at *Ulysses* 15.4804), and it is Bloom who presides over his rebirth (*Ulysses* 15.4906–4931). In the subsequent chapters, Bloom begins the work of establishing his new relationship. In both *Ulysses* and the *Aeneid*, the success of the enterprise of building a new home is questionable. Nevertheless, *Aeneid* 6 and “Circe” are the moments when the heroes turn away from the past and look toward the future.⁶

The methods by which “Circe” and *Aeneid* 6 effect their transitions are also similar. Ellmann likens Bloom’s journey in “Circe” to that of Dante in the *Divine Comedy* (Ellmann 1972, 147–149). He continues to argue that “Circe” represents a *katabasis* by suggesting, “Like Christ, or Orpheus, or Odysseus, Bloom harrows hell” (Ellmann 1972, 148). Kenner also sees the world of the dead in “Circe,” calling his chapter about the episode “Death and Resurrection” (Kenner 1987, 118). It is “Circe,” rather than “Hades” in which the heroes of *Ulysses* journey through the land of the dead and return to the land of the living. Both Bloom and Stephen see their dead parents (and Stephen’s living father Simon appears as well), and Bloom sees the ghost of his descendant, Rudy. Even the setting of the episode, “night-town,” subtly suggests a journey through a dark place.

Like “Circe,” *Aeneid* 6 bridges two parts of the narrative with a journey to the underworld and back. There is, however, an important difference. The most important ghosts Aeneas sees in the underworld are in the parade of heroes, in which he sees not his personal past, but his political future (*Aeneid* 6.756–892).⁷ The visions of “Circe” are both more personal and more oriented toward the past (Ferrer 1984). The difference is not absolute. Aeneas, before he finds his father in Elysium, passes through the other regions of the underworld in which he sees the ghosts of his own personal past.⁸ He meets his late helmsman Palinurus (*Aeneid* 6.337–383), Dido (*Aeneid* 6.450–476), and a group of soldiers from the Trojan War (*Aeneid* 6.477–493), including especially his cousin Deiphobus (*Aeneid* 6.494–547). Moreover, the political future Aeneas sees is ultimately the future of his own family, the Julian line that leads from Aeneas to Augustus.⁹ So while the parade of heroes is political, it is also a personal, familial vision for Aeneas. And just as the *katabasis* in the *Aeneid* contains Aeneas’s personal past as well as his political future, so do the visions in “Circe” contain Bloom’s political future as well as his personal past. The hallucination is not a real future, but an (at times) optimistic vision in which Bloom founds and rules his new Bloomusalem (*Ulysses* 15.1354–1956).¹⁰ Although “Circe” emphasizes the inner, personal pasts of Bloom and Stephen and *Aeneid* 6 emphasizes the future of Aeneas’s people, both series of visions blur the distinction between the psychology of the past and the politics of the future.

Once the connection between *Aeneid* 6 and “Circe” is made, it is easy to see many possible direct allusions. First, on his way into nighttown, Stephen “flourishes

his *ashplant*" (*Ulysses* 15.99), which will act as a talisman for him in the episode. Shortly after the flourish, Lynch curses the ashplant, "Damn your yellow stick" (*Ulysses* 15.120). It is hard not to recall the "aureus . . . ramus" ("golden bough"; *Aeneid* 6.137) that gains Aeneas entrance to the underworld. Moreover, the Sibyl flourishes the "yellow stick" on behalf of Aeneas on the way into the underworld, "'at ramum hunc' (aperit ramum qui veste latebat) / 'agnoscas.'" ("but this bough [she uncovers the bough which was hidden in her clothes] you should recognize"; *Aeneid* 6.406–407).¹¹ Next, when Bloom enters nighttown he is bothered by a dog who persuades him to drop his crubeen and trotter (*Ulysses* 15.656–675), after which the dog leaves him alone. Aeneas would have been stopped by Cerberus, had the Sibyl not fed him a drugged snack (*Aeneid* 6.420). There is another allusion soon after, when Signor Maffei boasts of his taming skill:

It was I broke in the bucking bronco Ajax with my patent spiked saddle for carnivores. Lash under the belly with a knotted thong. Block tackle and a strangling pulley will bring your lion to heel, no matter how fractious, even *Leo ferox* there, the Libyan maneater. (*Ulysses* 15.708–712)

The mention of Ajax brings to mind Odysseus's encounter with the ghost of Ajax (*Odyssey* 11.541–567), which in turn was the model for Aeneas's encounter in the underworld with the ghost of Dido (*Aeneid* 6.456–476; Austin 1986, ad 456; Servius, ad 6.468), and Dido might be characterized, however harshly, as a Libyan maneater.¹² Also in reference to Dido, at the height of his hallucination, Bloom, having recently "repudiated [his] former spouse" (*Ulysses* 15.1505–1506), sings a song beginning, "I vowed that I would never leave her" (*Ulysses* 15.1723), suggesting Dido's perception that Aeneas had married and then left her.¹³ Just a few lines later, the Sibyl also makes a brief appearance. She declares, "(*enthusiastically*) I'm a Bloomite and I glory in it. I believe in him in spite of all. I'd give my life for him, the funniest man on earth" (*Ulysses* 15.1736–1737). And finally, discussing a dream of Stephen's, Zoe says, "Go abroad and love a foreign lady" (*Ulysses* 15.3924), to which Lynch responds, "Across the world for a wife" (*Ulysses* 15.3926). Aeneas does both of these things, going abroad and loving Dido, and traveling across the world to find his destined wife, Lavinia.

In addition to the direct references to *Aeneid* 6, there are also in "Circe" a few allusions to the legend of Daedalus, which in turn refer to *Aeneid* 6. Pasiphae gets a brief mention when Stephen says, "Queens lay with prize bulls. Remember Pasiphae for whose lust my grandoldgrossfather made the first confession box" (*Ulysses* 15.3865–3869). Schork suggests that Joyce's source here is Ovid (*Metamorphoses* 8.155–157; Schork 1997, 156–157), but Pasiphae also makes two appearances

in *Aeneid* 6. Aeneas sees her near Dido among those who died for love (*Aeneid* 6.447), and the story of Daedalus, including his work for Pasiphae and his flight from Crete, appears on the doors of the temple of Apollo where Aeneas meets the Sibyl (*Aeneid* 6.14–41). Later in “Circe” Stephen describes a dream to his friends and the prostitutes in Bella Cohen’s brothel. In part of the dream he flies: “No, I flew. My foes beneath me. And ever shall be. World without end. (*he cries*) *Pater!* Free!” (*Ulysses* 15.3935–3936). In response to his call “*Pater!*” as he is describing his dream, Stephen’s father, Simon, appears in the brothel “*on strong ponderous buzzard wings*” (*Ulysses* 15.3946). Stephen’s flight and his father’s wings allude to Icarus and Daedalus. Here again Schork assigns the allusion to Ovid (especially since Icarus does cry, *pater!* at *Ars Amatoria* 2.91; Schork 1997, 157), but this does not exclude an additional allusion to the story of Icarus as it appears in *Aeneid* 6. The allusions to Pasiphae and the flight of Daedalus and Icarus may use Ovid as a source, but the presence of the Daedalus story in *Aeneid* 6 may also have inspired its appearance in “Circe.”

There is one further general, thematic link between “Circe” and *Aeneid* 6. “Circe” contains numerous allusions to *Hamlet*, dealing in particular with the theme of fathers and sons in the play.¹⁴ Joyce connected the theme of fathers and sons in *Hamlet* with the same theme in *Aeneid* 6, combining allusions to Shakespeare’s play with allusions to Virgil’s epic (Schork 1997, 131). This time the trace begins in the ninth chapter of *Ulysses*, “Scylla and Charybdis.” In this episode, Stephen leads a discussion in the National Library on Shakespeare. Regarding Stephen’s argument on Shakespeare, Joyce’s friend Thomas McGreevy reports:

[Joyce said that] I [McGreevy] was the first person who had ever sensed its significance for him and apropos of it, referred to the importance of the descent into the underworld of Aeneas searching for his father. (Dawson 1988, 309; cited in Schork 1997, 131)

McGreevy’s note confirms that Joyce connected the theme of fathers and sons in *Hamlet* with the same theme in Aeneas’s journey to the underworld. Not only does Shakespeare use the *Aeneid* as a thematic influence for *Hamlet*, but Joyce exploits that influence by alluding to the *Aeneid* through *Hamlet*.¹⁵

Before discussing the ways in which “Circe” alludes to *Aeneid* 6 through *Hamlet*, it is necessary to work out the connections between *Hamlet* and the *Aeneid* in earlier episodes of *Ulysses*. Before “Circe,” Stephen’s argument about the theme of fathers and sons in *Hamlet* appears most prominently in “Telemachus” and “Scylla and Charybdis.” In “Telemachus,” Buck Mulligan gives a preview of

the argument: "It's quite simple. He proves by algebra that Hamlet's grandson is Shakespeare's grandfather and that he himself is the ghost of his own father" (*Ulysses* 1.555–557). Mulligan then adds the comment, "O, shade of Kinch the elder! Japhet in search of a father!" (*Ulysses* 1.561). Japhet, as Gifford points out, is the foundling protagonist of an 1836 novel as well as Noah's son and a "legendary ancestor of a varied group of nations" (Gifford 1989, ad 1.561). As Mulligan's summary shows, Stephen's concern with *Hamlet* is with the theme of fathers and sons. It deals with the specific families of Hamlet and Shakespeare, and through Japhet it also deals with larger national and ancestral relations. McGreevy's note that Joyce connected Stephen's analysis of fathers and sons in *Hamlet* with Aeneas and the ghost of Anchises in the underworld suggests correspondences between the characters Mulligan mentions and Aeneas and Anchises. Japhet, the legendary ancestor in search of a father, is like Aeneas. Moreover, since the "shade of Kinch the elder" is Stephen's father (or perhaps Stephen himself as his own father), Stephen is also like Aeneas in search of his father's ghost.

It is also possible to see the connection with Aeneas in Stephen's own account of his argument. Stephen summarizes his reading of *Hamlet* in "Scylla and Charybdis":

When Rutlandbaconsouthamptonshakespeare or another poet of the same name in the comedy of errors wrote *Hamlet* he was not the father of his own son merely but, being no more a son, he was and felt himself the father of all his race, the father of his own grandfather, the father of his unborn grandson who, by the same token, never was born. (*Ulysses* 9.865–870)

As Mulligan suggested earlier, Stephen's argument is about immediate patrilineal relations as well as ancestral relationships. The author of *Hamlet* is both the "father of his own son" and the "father of all his race." Knowing, thanks to McGreevy, that Joyce has Aeneas and the ghost of Anchises in mind, there are traces of Aeneas in "the father of all his race." Once Aeneas is "no more a son" when his father is dead, he takes on the role of the "father of his race," both as the leader of the Trojans and as the founder of Rome. In *Aeneid* 4, for example, Jupiter explains Aeneas's mission:

sed fore qui gravidam imperiis belloque frementem
Italiam regeret, genus alto a sanguine Teucris
proderet, ac totum sub leges mitteret orbem.

Aeneid 4.229–231

But that he would be one who would rule Italy, pregnant with empire and roaring with war, one who would produce a race from the noble blood of Teucer, and one who would subject the whole world to laws.

Here Aeneas is one who *genus proderet* ("would produce a race"). When Stephen makes his argument about *Hamlet*, Aeneas is lurking in the background. In *Hamlet*, and in particular in the relationship between Hamlet and the ghost of his father, Joyce saw a parallel with Aeneas and the ghost of Anchises.

The reason the connection between *Hamlet* and *Aeneid* 6 is relevant here is that "Circe" is, in the words of Marguerite Harkness, "the culmination of the *Hamlet* references and motifs of the novel" (Harkness 1975, 259). Harkness argues in particular that *Hamlet* holds the key to the father-son relationship between Bloom and Stephen (Edwards 1950; Harkness 1975). When Shakespeare appears in "Circe," he joins Bloom and Stephen in a mirror:

(Stephen and Bloom gaze in the mirror. The face of William Shakespeare, beardless, appears there, rigid in facial paralysis, crowned by the reflection of the reindeer antlered hatrack in the hall.) (Ulysses 15.3821–3824)

Not only do the faces of Stephen, Bloom, and Shakespeare all appear in the mirror, but the horns join them as well. The horns represent the cuckold (Gifford 1989, ad 15.3764), as made explicit when Boylan appears and "hangs his hat smartly on a peg of Bloom's antlered head" (*Ulysses* 15.3763–3764). Stephen argues in "Scylla and Charybdis" that Shakespeare too was a cuckold (*Ulysses* 9.982–1025). Harkness argues that Stephen is also "cuckolded" by his father because he is "an oedipal son" (Harkness 1975, 267). After all, Stephen's mother does appear to him in a brothel (*Ulysses* 15.4157; Harkness 1975, 264). Stephen takes on the role of the son as Bloom takes the role of the father, and they are joined by Shakespeare. In *Aeneid* 6, Aeneas goes to the underworld to see his father, and in "Circe" Stephen meets his surrogate father Bloom.

In addition to Shakespeare's facilitation of Bloom's and Stephen's father-son connection, an allusion to *Hamlet* also aligns Bloom with Aeneas, searching for his own father. The first ghost Bloom sees in "Circe," that of Paddy Dignam, greets him, "Bloom, I am Paddy Dignam's spirit. List, list, O list!" (*Ulysses* 15.1217), echoing the ghost of Hamlet's father (I.v.22). This aligns Bloom with the son, Hamlet, and the ghost of Dignam with his father. The connection to Aeneas and Anchises comes just a few lines later, when Dignam explains his appearance, "By metempsychosis" (*Ulysses* 15.1226). In *Aeneid* 6, when Aeneas asks why the souls who are in Elysium would want to return to the mortal world, Anchises explains

to Aeneas the workings of metempsychosis (*Aeneid* 6.719–751). According to Anchises, purified souls, after a thousand years in Elysium, drink from the river Lethe and return to the upper world in new bodies.¹⁶ The ghost of Dignam, as Bloom's father, is like the ghost of Anchises, explaining metempsychosis to his son. Bloom also associates Dignam with his father in "Aeolus" when he watches the typesetter prepare Dignam's funeral notice, "mangiD kcirtaP. Poor papa with his hagadah book, reading backwards with his finger to me" (*Ulysses* 7.206–207). The backward reading, in turn, looks forward to the image of Rudy reading right to left at the end of "Circe" (*Ulysses* 15.4959; Harkness 1975, 264). The series sets Bloom up as Aeneas. He arrives in nighttown and meets the ghost of his father, and at the end he sees the image of his descendant. Though the allusion begins when the ghost of Dignam echoes the ghost of Hamlet's father rather than the ghost of Aeneas's father, the connection between the *Hamlet* discussion in "Scylla and Charybdis" and Aeneas's search for his father makes the connection between Bloom and Aeneas in "Circe." McGreevy's note shows that Joyce associated *Hamlet* with Aeneas's search for his father's ghost in *Aeneid* 6, and the use of *Hamlet* in "Circe" in turn shows that *Aeneid* 6 is thematically important to the episode.

Rudy and Marcellus

The thematic and narrative parallels between "Circe" and *Aeneid* 6, the specific allusions, and the evidence that Joyce connected the theme of fathers and sons in *Ulysses* to Aeneas and Anchises through *Hamlet* all support the idea that the appearance of Rudy at the end of "Circe" alludes to the appearance of Marcellus at the end of *Aeneid* 6. When Aeneas finds Anchises in Elysium, Anchises shows his son the spirits of his future Roman descendants—the so-called parade of heroes. Anchises points out especially his and Aeneas's direct descendants, the Julian line, including Romulus, Caesar, Augustus, and Marcellus. Marcellus, the son of Augustus's sister Octavia and husband of Augustus's daughter Julia, was Augustus's nephew and son-in-law. Marcellus died as a teenager in 23 BCE, and the family was devastated. The whole parade of heroes takes the form of a sort of funeral for Marcellus (*Aeneid* 6.868–886; Brenk 1990; Burke 1979; Feeney 1986; Habinek 1989). Roman aristocratic funerals involved a procession in which the family members of the deceased wore masks of their ancestors. In the case of Augustus's funeral, the procession also included important historical figures seemingly unrelated to the Julian family, and even figures from conquered peoples (Burke 1979, 222). The parade of heroes in *Aeneid* 6, which culminates in Anchises's eulogy for Marcellus, is much like the procession of the ancestors in an aristocratic Roman funeral. The tragic death of Marcellus is the last image in Virgil's parade

of heroes, and the final vision of "Circe" is the ghost of Rudy, Bloom's son, whose devastating early death deeply affected the Bloom family. The death of Rudy and the appearance of his ghost in "Circe" are personal, familial events for Bloom. The association with Marcellus, however, politicizes Rudy. While Marcellus's early death was a personal tragedy for Augustus's family, there were also enormous political consequences, including a threat of civil war. By alluding to Marcellus at the end of "Circe," *Ulysses* uses the Bloom family to create a sense of political uncertainty about the future of Ireland.

Both historically and within the *Aeneid*, Marcellus had a great impact on the politics of Rome, though in reality the politics of his death were somewhat more complex than they appear in the poem. Although Augustus would in fact live until 14 CE, at the beginning of 23 BCE his health was failing and it appeared that he would die.¹⁷ A power struggle was looming. Officially, of course, Augustus had restored the republican government and the power was in the Senate, but as a practical matter, a successor was inevitable.¹⁸ Augustus's second-in-command, Agrippa, seemed the most capable choice to succeed him, but there were rumors that Augustus himself wished Marcellus to take control. Already at nineteen he was a prominent figure, and he was the closest thing to a son of the *princeps*. The circumstances were reminiscent of those leading to the last Roman civil war, between Caesar's lieutenant Antony and his heir Octavian. The feared war never materialized, however, since Augustus recovered and it was instead Marcellus who died. Agrippa's subsequent marriage to Marcellus's widow, Julia, along with a series of successful military campaigns and the good health of Augustus, alleviated any immediate concerns. The succession, however, remained contested (Raaflaub and Samons 1990, 428–433; Eder 1990, 120–122). It was clear that there would be a successor, but his identity was in doubt.

In the *Aeneid*, the role of Marcellus is somewhat simpler than it was in reality. In the poem, and in the parade of heroes as much as anywhere else, the stress is on the heritage of the Julian line.¹⁹ Augustus, as the descendant of Aeneas, is the destined ruler of Rome. The abrupt end of the parade, then, at the death of Marcellus, indicates the end of the line (Williams 1983, 214). Anchises's eulogy describes Marcellus as the ultimate Roman who would have surpassed all those who came before:

nec puer Iliaca quisquam de gente Latinos
in tantum spe tollet avos, nec Romula quondam
ullo se tantum tellus iactabit alumno.
heu pietas, heu prisca fides invictaque bello
dextera! Non illi se quisquam impune tulisset

obvius armato, seu cum pedes iret in hostem
seu spumantis equi foderet calcaribus armos.
heu, miderande puer, si qua fata aspera rumpas!²⁰
tu Marcellus eris.

Aeneid 6.875–883

Not any boy of the Trojan race will raise his Latin ancestors to such a height in hope, nor will the land of Romulus ever take such pride in any child. Alas for his piety, alas for his old-fashioned faith and his right hand unbeaten in war! No one would have come to meet him, armed, without harm, whether he attacked the enemy going on foot or dug at the sides of a foaming horse with spurs. Alas, pitiable boy, if only somehow you could break through harsh fate! You will be Marcellus.

In the *Aeneid*, Marcellus is the greatest of his race, and to end the procession of great Romans with his untimely death suggests that there could be no replacement. Politically, it leaves the future in grave doubt. Whatever the situation in reality, in the *Aeneid* Marcellus is undoubtedly the heir (Williams 1987, 40). The parade of heroes ends on a note of personal tragedy and political uncertainty, calling into question the durability of the Augustan achievement.²¹

At the end of “Circe,” Bloom seems to have found his new son in Stephen. He has watched over him in Bella Cohen’s, making sure he is not cheated (*Ulysses* 15.4277–4308; Kenner 1974, 350–351). When Private Carr knocks Stephen out and the undertaker Kelleher comes by, it is Bloom who stands over Stephen and brings him back (*Ulysses* 15.4745–4954). But just when it seems Bloom has made his new connection, the ghost of his dead son appears to him:

(Silent, thoughtful, alert he stands on guard, his fingers at his lips in the attitude of a secret master. Against the dark wall a figure appears slowly, a fairy boy of eleven, a changeling, kidnapped, dressed in a Eton suit with glass shoes and a little bronze helmet, holding a book in his hand. He reads from right to left inaudibly, smiling, kissing the page.)

BLOOM

(wonderstruck, calls inaudibly) Rudy!

RUDY

(gazes, unseeing, into Bloom’s eyes and goes on reading, kissing, smiling. He has a delicate mauve face. On his suit he has diamond and ruby buttons. In his free left hand he holds a slim ivory cane with a violet bowknot. A white lambkin peeps out of his waistcoat pocket.) (*Ulysses* 15.4955–4967)

Bloom has been trying to find Stephen and connect with him, but at the moment when it seems he has achieved his goal, he has a vision that calls into question the possibility of success. The ghost serves as a reminder that Stephen is not, in fact, Bloom's son. It was Rudy, not Stephen, who was the continuation of Bloom's family. Rudy is reading from right to left, presumably because the book he is reading is in Hebrew. In "Aeolus," Bloom was reading from right to left as he watched the typesetter work, and the direction of his reading reminded him of his father's "backwards" reading of the Haggadah (*Ulysses* 7.206–207; Harkness 1975, 264). Rudy's right-to-left reading emphasizes the continuity of the Bloom family. Though Stephen may be forming a connection with Bloom, he is not actually a part of the Jewish Bloom family, and he cannot fully replace Bloom's own son. By ending "Circe" with Rudy's ghost, *Ulysses* demonstrates that his death is not so easily overcome.

The narrative similarities in their appearances connect Rudy and Marcellus, but there is also a subtle clue in Rudy's appearance pointing to the Roman heir. Rudy is holding an ivory cane, which Gifford identifies as the *scipio eburneus*.²² Roman kings and consuls carried this ivory scepter as a symbol of office. Marcellus, since he was not yet a consul when he died, would not have carried the ivory scepter, but had he lived he surely would have. Already at nineteen he was an aedile and was expected to become consul at a scandalously young age (Syme 1939, 341). When Rudy appears as the ghost of the boy he would have been, he carries the scepter Marcellus would have carried. The ivory cane associates Rudy with Roman royalty and consulship, and strengthens his association with Marcellus.

Ivory also bears another significance at the end of *Aeneid* 6. When Aeneas leaves the underworld he does so, surprisingly, through the ivory gate of false dreams ("falsa . . . insomnia"; *Aeneid* 6.896) rather than the horn gate of true shades ("veris . . . umbris"; *Aeneid* 6.894). Virgil explains:

his ibi tum natum Anchises unaque Sibyllam
prosequitur dictis portaque emittit eburna,
ille viam secut ad navis sociosque revisit.

Aeneid 6.897–899

With these things having been said, Anchises then accompanies his son there together with the Sibyl and sends them out the ivory gate; Aeneas cuts a path to the ships and rejoins his companions.

There is considerable debate over the significance of Aeneas's exit.²³ It seems to many readers that it would make better sense for Aeneas to exit through the horn

gate of true shades than the ivory gate of false dreams. The fact that Aeneas must use the gate of "false dreams" casts doubt on what he has seen in the underworld. The ivory gate suggests that Anchises's optimistic vision of the end of civil war and a new golden age might itself be a false dream (O'Hara 1990, 172). The hope of peace for Aeneas's people and his family, already questioned by the death of Marcellus, is placed in deeper doubt by the ivory gate. Ellmann identifies Rudy's cane as Stephen's ashplant transfigured (Ellmann 1972, 149), and if the ashplant is, like the golden bough, the way into the underworld, then its transfigured form is a way out. Rudy's cane, made of ivory, is Bloom's exit from the underworld. Through the ivory gate of the *Aeneid*, which casts doubt on the ability of Augustus's family to heal the rifts of the Roman civil wars, the ivory of Rudy's cane casts doubt on Bloom's optimistic effort to heal the rifts in his family.²⁴

The allusion to Marcellus suggests that there is more at stake in "Circe" than merely Bloom's family. Marcellus's death was not only a familial event, but also a political one. A historical allusion connecting Rudy with the Hapsburg prince Rudolf confirms and strengthens the political dimension of Rudy's appearance. Arthur Griffith founded *Sinn Féin* with the idea that Ireland and England would have a dual monarchy according to the model of Austria and Hungary (Lyons 1971, 247–249). Bloom is of Hungarian descent, and in "Cyclops" John Wyse Nolan, one of the drinkers in Barney Kiernan's pub, claims that it was Bloom who gave Griffith the idea (*Ulysses* 12.1574). The Hungarian descent of the Bloom family and the suggestion that Bloom thought of Austria-Hungary as a model for England and Ireland also point to a connection between Rudy and the crown prince Rudolf of the Austro-Hungarian empire.²⁵ Rudolf died under mysterious circumstances in 1889, devastating the emperor Franz Joseph and the empress Elizabeth and casting doubt on the succession. Ultimately, Franz Joseph's nephew, Franz Ferdinand, would be named heir. When Franz Ferdinand was assassinated in Sarajevo in 1914, the result was World War I. As late as 1912, Franz Joseph was representing himself as the fulfillment of the promise of Virgil's fourth *Eclogue*, connecting the Hapsburg dynasty to Virgil's Rome (Tanner 1993, 222). The connection between Rudy and Rudolf underscores the significance for "Circe" of the political dimension of Marcellus's death. The appearance of Rudy's ghost is not only a reminder that Bloom's family is broken, but also a foreboding reminder of the danger of uncertain succession. The rift in Bloom's family is connected with the uncertain future of Ireland.

In "Circe," Bloom is not just any Irishman. In an extended sequence, Bloom is a political figure, even an emperor, making his familial affairs political. It is not entirely clear whether the sequence is a hallucination or merely a fantasy, but in the instant between Zoe's "Go on. Make a stump speech out of it" (*Ulysses* 15.1353)

and "Talk away till you're black in the face" (*Ulysses* 15.1958) Bloom experiences an impressive political career. He starts as a workman (*Ulysses* 15.1355) and is soon the Lord mayor of Dublin (*Ulysses* 15.1363). From there he becomes the emperor of Ireland:

THE BISHOP OF DOWN AND CONNOR

I here present your undoubted emperor-president and king-chairman, the most serene and potent and very puissant ruler of this realm. God save Leopold the First!

ALL

God save Leopold the First!

BLOOM

(*in dalmatic and purple mantle, to the bishop of Down and Connor, with dignity*) Thanks, somewhat eminent sir.

WILLIAM, ARCHBISHOP OF ARMAGH

(*in purple stock and shovel hat*) Will you to your power cause law and mercy to be executed in all your judgments in Ireland and the territories thereunto belonging? (*Ulysses* 15.1470–1482)

Bloom appears here as the ruler of an Irish empire, accompanied by, among other symbols, the "imperial eagles" that were emblematic of the Roman army (*Ulysses* 15.1408). It is to his imperial subjects that he announces the imminent "golden city which is to be, the new Bloomusalem in the Nova Hibernia of the future" (*Ulysses* 15.1544–1545). Like Augustus, he leads his people into a new golden age.²⁶ Furthermore, reminiscent of the Roman emperors' apotheoses, the Sibyl calls Bloom, "My hero god!" (*Ulysses* 15.1744). Even when public opinion turns against him and he is on trial, Bloom is godlike. A voice asks, "Bloom, are you the Messiah ben Joseph or ben David?" (*Ulysses* 15.1834), and he replies, "You have said it" (*Ulysses* 15.1836). And at his death a "choir of six hundred voices" sings the chorus from Handel's *Messiah* (*Ulysses* 15.1953–1954). Though he appears outwardly as an ordinary citizen, Bloom is, at least in his own mind, a deified and messianic emperor who will lead the Irish people into a new golden age.

Bloom's empire means that the death of his son is a political problem. Harkness argues for the connection between family and politics through *Hamlet*: "Just as the mousetrap reveals the hidden malady of Denmark, so 'Circe' reveals the hidden malady of Dublin, its lack of meaningful relationships, epitomized by Stephen's need for a father and Bloom's need for a son" (Harkness 1975, 262). The ghost of Rudy reveals what is rotten in the state of Ireland. But this is not merely a problem of human relationships, nor is "Circe" suggesting that increased fertility or decreased

infant mortality would be a solution to the social and political ills of Ireland. Rather, the question is one of political succession and decolonization. The death of the emperor's son raises the question of who will take over at his death, and it raises the specter of civil war. The question is an immediate and crucial one for Ireland on the cusp of independence. While Joyce as he was writing *Ulysses* could not have known that there would be a civil war, or even that Ireland would win independence, the end of "Circe" anticipates the independence and the allusion to Virgil's Marcellus foresees that the process of political succession will not be straightforward. Although historically the feared Roman civil war did not materialize within Virgil's lifetime, this was only a temporary reprieve. The lament for Marcellus emphasizes the difficulty of succession that would lead to many future civil wars, beginning with the end of the Julio-Claudian dynasty at the death of Nero in 68. Though neither Virgil nor Joyce could specifically predict the future, both presciently undercut the optimism of revolutionary moments, adumbrating conflict and violence that would eventually materialize.

"Circe" and the Problem of Succession

"Circe" foresees that the question of who will rule Ireland is not simply an issue of conflict between an internally homogeneous Ireland and the external power of the British Empire. As the conflict between Bloom and the militantly nationalist "citizen" in "Cyclops" shows, Ireland is far from univocal, and Irish people may disagree significantly on political issues.²⁷ In "Cyclops" the citizen represents the militant nationalists, while Bloom is a pacifist and an immigrant interrupting the homogeneity of the emerging nation. The citizen reappears more than once in "Circe," first when he praises the emperor Bloom (*Ulysses* 15.1616–1618) and a second time when he thanks heaven at Bloom's death (*Ulysses* 15.1933). His wavering hints at unstable support from the nationalists. More significantly, the citizen shows up again during the final showdown between Stephen and Private Carr. In this scene his adversary is not Bloom, but Molly's father, Major Tweedy of the Royal Dublin Fusiliers: "(*Major Tweedy and the Citizen exhibit to each other medals, decorations, trophies of war, wounds. Both salute with fierce hostility.*)" (*Ulysses* 15.4622–4624). Tweedy and the citizen face off while, "(*Massed bands blare Garryowen and God Save the King.*)" (*Ulysses* 15.4630). Nolan notes the symmetry of the two figures and argues that it reveals a "secret equivalence" (Nolan 1995, 56). The equivalence is not merely that Tweedy and the citizen are opposites, but also that they are both Irish. Tweedy, in spite of his service in the British army, is nevertheless an Irishman. Tweedy and the citizen are fierce enemies, and men like them could not be expected simply to put aside their differences

after the treaty. Even if one discounts the disagreements between the nationalists, a continuing civil war, or at least extensive sectarian violence, was predictable following the War of Independence (Lyons 1971, 451). Although the opposition of Tweedy and the citizen does not accurately predict the nature of the civil war as one between different parties of Irish nationalists, it does suggest that the War of Independence will not easily resolve the conflict between unionists and nationalists.

While Tweedy is a representative of the British military presence in Ireland, I argued in chapter 1 that the citizen also represents a violently oppressive monarchy. "Cyclops" associates the violent nationalism of the citizen with the oppression of a foreign monarch. The intertextual and covert presence of the monarchy within Irish nationalism sets up the anti-colonial struggle as a problem of imperial succession. "Circe" negotiates the problem by means of two allusions to Virgil. The allusion to Virgil's Cacus sets up the conflict between the citizen and Major Tweedy as an internal Irish division over the postcolonial succession, and the allusion to Virgil's Marcellus links these problems of the Irish postcolonial succession to the problems of succession in the Bloom family.

The form of "Circe" as well as its content illustrates the difficulty of the political succession of Ireland. As Nolan and Herr point out, the music hall and pantomime that give "Circe" its form are British entertainments frequently decried by nationalists (Herr 1986, 204; Nolan 1995, 135). The use of British forms in the structure of "Circe" shows the pervasiveness of British culture in Dublin and the difficulty of de-Anglicization. Gibson further argues that "Circe" is the chapter of *Ulysses* that most effectively demonstrates the pervasiveness of Anglicization in Ireland (Gibson 2002, 183–198). Not only do British soldiers and the British king appear in night-town, but many of the Irish characters exhibit a strong British influence. Gibson notes among many other examples the Bluecoat Schoolboy (*Ulysses* 15.1535–1536), Bella Cohen's son at Oxford (*Ulysses* 15.1289, 4306), and Bloom's "English invention" to quiet snoring (*Ulysses* 15.3275; Gibson 2002, 187). I would add Rudy's Eton suit (*Ulysses* 15.4958). Even the language of "Circe" shows the ubiquitous English presence in Dublin. Gibson argues, "There is much more the *sound* of Englishness here . . . than anywhere else in the book. The chapter is full of decent, respectable, prim, and outraged English and Anglo-Irish voices seldom heard elsewhere" (Gibson 2002, 188). The pantomime form and the language of the characters illustrate the insinuation of English culture into Ireland. Achieving Irish independence is not just a matter of winning the war, but will involve a complex, post-colonial, cultural negotiation. Such decisions will pit the Irish against themselves.

The discontinuous and anti-narrative style of "Circe" also suggests difficulties of succession. "Circe" is one of the most complex and difficult chapters of *Ulysses*. In fact, it was in writing "Circe" that Joyce realized the scope and complexity his

novel would require.²⁸ Nolan points out that the anti-narrative style of the episode has traditionally been taken to be anti-nationalist (Nolan 1995, 55–62). The refusal of traditional plot also refuses the story of Ireland and the narrative continuity of Irish nationalism, unwilling to buy into the idea of a homogeneous and unified nation. Nolan, however, argues that the lack of narrative continuity can be read as nationalist as well. The discontinuous narrative of *Ulysses*, and “Circe” especially, refutes the story of the British Empire as much as (if not more than) it does that of the Irish nation. The discontinuous plot of “Circe” may be both anti-colonialist and anti-nationalist, but in either case it illustrates a problem of succession. A smooth narrative flows easily from one event to the next, and by interrupting that flow “Circe” notes the difficulty of organizing a succession. The ghost of Rudy connects Bloom’s familial discontinuity with the political discontinuity of Ireland, and the discontinuous narrative structure of “Circe” presents the same idea on the level of the form.

It is striking that the allusion to Marcellus sets up a parallel rather than a contrast between Ireland and the Roman Empire. The more natural parallel would be between the Roman and British Empires, and elsewhere in *Ulysses* and in Irish nationalist culture in general this parallel is explicit.²⁹ By aligning the Bloom family with the Julio-Claudian dynasty, “Circe” remarkably reverses the usual parallel, setting up a correspondence between the Roman Empire and the emerging Irish nation. This does not mean that the novel treats Rome either as a positive model or as a negative precedent for Ireland. Rather, the parallel complicates and upsets the opposition between the empire and the postcolonial nation. If Irish nationalists during the struggle for independence imagined a radical difference between imperialism and nationalism, or between life in an oppressed colony and life in a postcolonial state, they were disappointed. “Circe” demonstrates that the process of decolonization in Ireland would involve letting go of the image of a pure and ideal Irish past (as conceived by revivalist nationalists like the citizen) and embracing the complex cultural negotiation of postcoloniality.³⁰ The figure of Rudy/Marcellus is a ghostly embodiment of the loss of a perfect past and acceptance of an imperfect future. And although Joyce could not have known it as he was writing “Circe,” it was precisely the refusal to accept an imperfect future that began the civil war in 1922.

“Circe” demonstrates the danger of combining the hybridity of the emerging Irish national culture with a violent nationalist movement. Once the violence is unleashed in the War of Independence, what will stop it from turning in on itself following the initial victory? If the Irish nationalists optimistically expected a smooth succession, they would unfortunately meet the ghost of Rudy. Through the allusion to Marcellus, Rudy’s ghost represents the death of the heir to the

emperor of Ireland. There will be no smooth succession, no straightforward story of winning independence. The unity of Ireland, an idea so crucial to the nationalist imagination, is only a ghost of what might have been—an optimistic vision that never comes to be. The ghost of Rudy does not, however, mean that “Circe” is a unionist or even an anti-nationalist episode. The threat of postcolonial civil war does not justify colonial oppression. “Circe” is rather an acknowledgement that decolonization will be a complex process involving internal conflict, and an acknowledgment of the difficulty of letting go of an ideal past in favor of a flawed future. Bloom does watch over Stephen and rescue him from nighttown. He does form a kind of fatherly connection for the future, but he is nevertheless haunted by past death. Bloom’s success shows hope for the new nation, but Rudy’s ghost all too accurately predicts the persistence of instability and internal violence in the future of Ireland.

In the previous chapter I showed the dependence of Joyce's "Circe" on the sixth book of Virgil's *Aeneid* and argued that "Circe" uses the familial and political disruption of the death of Marcellus to link the death of Rudy Bloom to the problem of postcolonial succession in Ireland. I further pointed out that the familial and political discontinuity that Rudy's ghost represents also appears in the narrative discontinuity of the episode. "Circe" is a particularly difficult episode in a difficult novel, and scholars of Joyce's politics have argued that the discontinuous narrative of the episode is political. Emer Nolan, for example, points out in *James Joyce and Nationalism* that linear and teleological narratives are characteristic of literature supportive of nationalist or imperialist politics.¹ David Quint makes a similar point in *Epic and Empire*, suggesting that the tradition of epic characterized by linear and teleological narrative is politically imperialist (Quint 1993). Enda Duffy argues that "Circe" is "difficult" and "surreal" because it confronts the reader with contradictions between the despair of violence and the optimism of the revolutionary moment that the reader must repress in constructing a unified narrative of independence.² In "Circe" and especially in the appearance of Rudy's ghost, *Ulysses* uses the *Aeneid* to bring together the familial discontinuity of Bloom's failure as a father with the political discontinuity of the failure of empire and the narrative discontinuity of the episode.

It is strange to think of the *Aeneid* as a poem that thematizes discontinuity rather than continuity. Spatially, the theme of *tota Italia* constructs Italy as a continuous territory. Temporally, the story of Aeneas links the Homeric tradition with Rome. Socially, it constructs a continuous and linear heritage from Aeneas to Augustus. Nevertheless, discontinuity is a theme that runs through several recent trends in Virgil scholarship. Early work on the "subjective style" of the poem used the idea to demonstrate its narrative and psychological continuity, arguing that "empathy" between the narrator and the characters as well as the poet's intrusions into the narrative unify the poem from a "subjective" point of view (Otis 1964; Heinze 1993). More recently, however, Gian Biagio Conte has used the idea of the

subjective style to stress the importance of “fragmentation” in the poem, likening it to a “broken mirror.”³ Other important approaches to the *Aeneid* have also, though less explicitly, emphasized its discontinuous nature. Narratological studies of the poem have discussed “deviant focalization,” which opens a breach between “who speaks” and “who sees” (Conte 1986, 152–156; Fowler 1990; Fowler 1991; Reed 2007). Adam Parry’s influential article “The Two Voices of Virgil’s *Aeneid*” has made a distinction between the “public voice” and “private voice” of the poem (Parry 1963). Parry’s distinction has been especially important for the so-called Harvard school of Virgil scholarship, which has demonstrated the dissonance between a surface of praise for Augustus (the public voice) and an underlying pessimism or subtle undermining of support for the Augustan project (the private voice).⁴ Such interruptions in the narrative and ideological continuity of the *Aeneid* have become an important focus in Virgil scholarship. In the previous chapter, I used the appearance of Marcellus at the end of *Aeneid* 6 to discuss the convergence of narrative, political, familial, and semantic discontinuities in Joyce’s “Circe.” In this chapter I argue that *Aeneid* 6 links those same multiple forms of discontinuity.

The discontinuities of *Aeneid* 6 are similar to the formal literary features that characterize Joyce’s modernist poetics. Just as the characters in Joyce’s “Aeolus,” “Cyclops,” and “Circe” knowingly and unknowingly incorporate Virgil and Roman culture in their constructions of the Irish nation, theories of modernism also incorporate classical forms and styles. Fredric Jameson’s schematic definition of the modern and postmodern in relation to stages of capitalism, for example, links the disruptions of form and content characteristic of modernist literature to the spread of imperialism:

At this point the phenomenological experience of the individual subject—traditionally, the supreme raw materials of the work of art—becomes limited to a tiny corner of the social world, a fixed-camera view of a certain section of London or the countryside or whatever. But the truth of that experience no longer coincides with the place in which it takes place. The truth of that limited daily experience of London lies, rather, in India or Jamaica or Hong Kong; it is bound up with the whole colonial system of the British Empire that determines the very quality of the individual’s subjective life. Yet those structural coordinates are no longer accessible to immediate lived experience and are often not even conceptualizable for most people. (Jameson 1988, 349)

The breach between local lived experience and the imperialism that provides the material of that existence is a cognitive gap that, for Jameson, spurs the invention of modernist literary forms:

It is evident that this new situation poses tremendous and crippling problems for a work of art; and I have argued that it is as an attempt to square this circle and to invent new and elaborate formal strategies for overcoming this dilemma that modernism or, perhaps better, the various modernisms as such emerge:⁵ in forms that inscribe a new sense of the absent global colonial system on the very syntax of poetic language itself, a new play of absence and presence that at its most simplified will be haunted by the erotic and be tattooed with foreign place names, and at its most intense will involve the invention of remarkable new languages and forms. (Jameson 1988, 349–350)

The link Jameson makes between the dislocations of life in the imperialist metropolis and the fragmentation and defamiliarization of modernist poetics might apply just as well to the innovative and defamiliarizing poetics of the *Aeneid* that I will identify in this chapter. The ruptures of the Augustan revolution, caught up as they are in issues of imperialism and the effects of conquest on life in the capital, find literary counterparts in ruptures of narrative and thematic continuity in the *Aeneid*. I will not argue that Jameson's schematic identification of modernist literary forms with imperialist politics is either accurate or not, but merely point out that his particular theory of modernism, which he later applies specifically to *Ulysses* (Jameson 1990), works as well with the *Aeneid* and the strategies of Augustan literature for dealing with the geographical realities of the empire. Ziolkowski has argued that modernism made Virgil into what he is today because modernist authors and scholars saw in Virgil's Rome a crisis similar to the crisis of modernity (Ziolkowski 1993, 3–26), and Jameson's theory of modernism shows just how present Virgilian poetics are even in late twentieth century conceptions of modernist poetics. Just as formulations of Joyce's semicolonality can apply equally well to Virgil's Italy,⁶ the discontinuities and disruptions characteristic of modernist literary forms are Virgilian strategies for constructing the poetics of the Augustan empire.

The semicolonial status of *Ulysses* means that it is not only a colonial and modernist novel, but also on the cusp of the postcolonial and postmodern. Enda Duffy argues that "Circe" in particular incorporates elements of postmodernity (Duffy 1994, 133). The association of modernism with imperialism and colonialism also involves an association of postmodernism with postcolonialism. It is this association that Homi Bhabha (1994) critiques in a chapter on "The Postcolonial and the Postmodern." In an ambivalent reading of Jameson's historicism that at times praises and at times attacks, Bhabha points out that postcolonial or postmodern thinking does not only mean a rethinking of the present that contests "grand narratives" and accounts for the "deconstruction of the 'sign'" (249), but it also means a rethinking of the past:

In general terms, there is a colonial contramodernity at work in the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century matrices of Western modernity that, if acknowledged, would question the historicism that analogically links, in a linear narrative, late capitalism and the fragmentary, simulacral, pastiche symptoms of post-modernity. This linking does not account for the historical traditions of cultural contingency and textual indeterminacy (as forces of social discourse) generated in the attempt to produce an enlightened colonial or post-colonial subject, and it transforms, in the process, our understanding of the narrative of modernity and the values of progress. (Bhabha 1994, 248)

The recognition of a “contramodernity” in the colonial past shows that post-modernity allows us to recognize its features, which Bhabha enumerates as “aporia, ambivalence, indeterminacy, the question of discursive closure, the threat to agency, the status of intentionality, the challenge to ‘totalizing’ concepts” (248) in discourses that are not historically postmodern or postcolonial. Bhabha notes, “C. L. R. James once remarked, in a public lecture, that the postcolonial prerogative consisted in reinterpreting and rewriting the forms and effects of an ‘older’ colonial consciousness from the later experience of the cultural displacement that marks the more recent, postwar histories of the Western metropolis” (249). From this perspective, the status of *Ulysses* as a modernist, postmodernist, or semicolonial text does not mean that its modernist, postmodernist, and semicolonial features are unique to its historical moment, but that it allows recognition of those features in earlier discourses and at earlier moments. The production of modernist and postmodernist poetics in the semicolonial moment is only a part of semicoloniality. Another part is the identification of and emphasis on modernist and postmodernist poetics in older texts, including the *Aeneid*. In this chapter I read such features of *Aeneid* 6 under the umbrella of discontinuity, or more specifically as ruptures of narrative, political, familial, and even semantic stability.

Aeneid 6 is a nexus of discontinuities in the narrative and form of the epic, and it begins with a geographical transition and an act of colonization. The transition from the Trojans’ wanderings to the war in Italy is the most significant break in the narrative of the *Aeneid*. In book 6 the Trojans have arrived in Italy but are not yet at their final destination. The book serves as a bridge between the journey in the first five books and the war in the last six. Within this transitional book three important passages deal explicitly with discontinuity: Daedalus’s temple doors, the Sibyl’s prophecy, and the parade of heroes, which culminates in the lament for Marcellus. In addition to the thematic discontinuity of the content of these three passages, which I discuss below, each one has a literary form that departs from the narrative continuity of the poem.⁷ First, the ekphrasis on Daedalus’s doors inserts

a separate narrative into the larger poem.⁸ Second, the Sibyl's prophecy departs from linear narrative by looking ahead.⁹ Finally, the parade of heroes looks to a historical future outside of the narrative of the *Aeneid*.¹⁰ While there are instances of discontinuity in various forms throughout the *Aeneid*, the combination of Daedalus's temple doors, the Sibyl's prophecy, and the parade of heroes makes for an extraordinary prevalence of discontinuity in book 6. None of the passages I analyze in this chapter has a unique form. In the *Aeneid* there are ekphrases besides the one describing doors of the temple of Apollo at Cumae, there are prophecies besides that of the Sibyl, there are visions of Rome's historical future besides the parade of heroes, and there are untimely deaths besides that of Marcellus. Nowhere else in the poem, however, is there such a concentration of passages in various forms dealing explicitly with the theme of discontinuity. Moreover, these three passages not only serve as examples of various kinds of discontinuity, but also construct links between the different kinds of discontinuity, treating narrative, political, familial, and semantic ruptures as a single theme.

Familial Discontinuity: Daedalus's Temple Doors

Aeneid 6 begins when Aeneas arrives at Cumae and views the doors of the temple of Apollo. Virgil's ekphrasis¹¹ of the doors is a self-referential reflection on narrative art,¹² calling into question the possibility of composing a continuous narrative. The *Aeneid* explains that when Daedalus arrived at Cumae after his famous and disastrous flight from Crete, he dedicated a temple to Apollo and he sculpted his autobiography in gold on the temple doors (*Aeneid* 6.14–37).¹³ He failed to complete the story when emotion overcame him and he was unable to sculpt the death of his son, Icarus. The incomplete narrative is the first thing Aeneas sees on his arrival in Italy, as he is on his way into the temple to speak with the Sibyl. The autobiography of Daedalus illustrates a failure of signification. The discontinuity here is a gap between the intention and the text. Daedalus cannot express what he means. Furthermore, Daedalus's sculpture adds a second discontinuity to the failure of signification. Not only does the ekphrasis involve a semantic discontinuity, but it also links that discontinuity to a familial break. It is the death of his son that causes Daedalus to fail.¹⁴ The doors of the temple form a link between semantic and patrilineal discontinuity.

The fact that the *Aeneid* forms the link between semantic and patrilineal discontinuity in the context of an ekphrasis is significant. Ekphrasis is an important and much-discussed topic in scholarship on the *Aeneid*.¹⁵ Ekphrases are descriptive interruptions of the main narrative. Scholars read such interruptions of the story

variously as a matter of epic retardation, an interaction of genres, or a site of conflicting voices or ideologies.¹⁶ As a form of epic retardation, ekphrasis represents the epic desire for full explanation and description. It is the totalizing impulse in epic, creating the impression that the poem encompasses every detail. In contrast to this view, the reading of ekphrasis as an interaction of genres suggests that ekphrasis fragments the narrative. Ekphrases are relatively short descriptions or alternative narratives, corresponding to the lyric form rather than epic narrative (Putnam 1998, 3). Not only do they interrupt the overall narrative by bringing in tangential material, but they also introduce an alternative set of generic norms and an alternative cognitive mode.

A third view, namely that ekphrasis is a site of conflicting voices, utilizes the tension between the totalizing and fragmenting impulses in ekphrasis. Rather than choosing between the reading of ekphrasis as an element of epic retardation or lyric interruption, it is possible to read ekphrasis as bearing multiple, undecidable significance. Much like Charles Martindale's polysemy "under the sign of intertextuality" (Martindale 1993a, 122), ekphrasis works in multiple registers. Intertextual allusion is polysemous because it utilizes the context of the surrounding text as well as the context of the source text. By utilizing multiple contexts, allusion opens a space between the words and the meaning of a text. Conte likens the space opened by intertextuality to the effect of a rhetorical figure, noting, "The gap in figurative language that opens between 'letter' and 'sense' is also created in allusion" (Conte 1986, 38–39; cited in Fowler 1991, 35). Alessandro Perutelli and Don Fowler borrow Conte's model of the rhetorical figure to read not intertextuality, but ekphrasis (Perutelli 1978; cited in Fowler 1991, 34). Ekphrasis, like allusion, brings an alternate narrative context into the poem, opening a space between the "letter" and the "sense" of the passage. Analyzing the semantic space opened by ekphrasis, Perutelli and Fowler stress the importance of maintaining the tension inherent in the form (Perutelli 1978; Fowler 1991). For Martindale's deconstructive approach, polysemy opens a space between signifier and signified; for Conte's combination of rhetoric and allusion, there is a space between "letter" and "sense"; and for Fowler's narratology the gap is between "who sees" and "who speaks." All three approaches rely on a "gap," a "space," or a discontinuity in signification.

Against a background of the discontinuity inherent in ekphrasis, Daedalus's sculpture thematizes both familial and textual discontinuity. The first scene depicts the untimely death of Minos's son Androgeos (*Aeneid* 6.20).¹⁷ While the *Aeneid* does not explicitly mention Androgeos's parentage, his status as a prematurely dead son is important because Minos's anger at the loss of his son motivates the next scene—the punishment of the Athenians:

in foribus letum Androgeo; tum pendere poenas
Cecropidae iussi (miserum!) septena quotannis
corpora natorum; stat ductis sortibus urna.

Aeneid 6.20–22

On the doors the death of Androgeos; then the descendants of Cecrops
ordered (alas!) to repay annually as punishment seven bodies of their children;
the urn stands with the lots having been drawn.

This description of the Athenians, paying the penalty for the death of Androgeos with the bodies of their own children (*corpora natorum*), refers to them as *Cecropidae* (descendants of Cecrops), emphasizing the disruption to their own ancestral line as a result of their punishment.¹⁸ The subsequent scenes depicted on the second door maintain the theme of familial discontinuity. Pasiphae (to whom Joyce alludes at *Ulysses* 15.3865), instead of bearing her husband Minos a child, gives birth to the Minotaur (*Aeneid* 6.23–26). Even the *regina* Ariadne, who also appears in the description,¹⁹ evokes the notion of discontinuity since her “great love” causes her to leave her family for Theseus and ultimately results in her abandonment (*Aeneid* 6.27–30). Finally, the ekphrasis notes the absence of a depiction of Icarus’s death:

tu quoque magnam
partem opere in tanto, sineret dolor, Icare, haberes.
bis contaus erat casus effingere in auro,
bis patriae cecidere manus.

Aeneid 6.30–33

You also would have had a large part in the great work, Icarus, if grief had
allowed it. Twice he had tried to depict your fall in gold, twice his fatherly
hands fell.

Although Aeneas does not see a scene of Icarus’s fall, the theme of ruptured families and premature death expects it, and the ekphrasis notes the absence. Each scene details some familial problem, and both of the scenes on the first door depict untimely death. The missing death of Icarus would not only complete the autobiography of Daedalus, but would also complete the theme begun with the death of Androgeos.

The last death interrupts not only the succession of Daedalus’s family, but also representation itself. Indeed, from the beginning, the ekphrasis has emphasized

discontinuity of narrative representation as well as familial discontinuity. The *Aeneid* introduces the story of Daedalus and the doors with the phrase *ut fama est* ("as the story goes"; *Aeneid* 6.14). This phrase marks the episode as a break in the narrative, even before the ekphrasis begins, stressing the interruption and resisting its incorporation (Putnam 1998, 77–78). The poem then presents the autobiographical narrative as a series of distinct scenes with almost no narrative material connecting them. The transition from one scene to the next is a single word: *tum* ("then"; *Aeneid* 6.20) takes the reader from Androgeos to the Athenian children; *contra* ("on the other side"; *Aeneid* 6.23) marks the shift to the next door and Cnossos; and *hic* ("here"; *Aeneid* 6.24, 26) introduces the scenes of Pasiphae and the labyrinth. The lack of any transitional word preceding the appearance of Daedalus pitying Ariadne (*Aeneid* 6.28–30) makes it impossible to determine whether the passage describes a new scene or expands the description of the labyrinth scene.²⁰ This abruptly shifting sequence of images forms a discontinuous narrative whose components blur together until the sequence gives way to the apostrophe to Icarus, at which point the description of the sculpture breaks off and the ekphrasis comes to a halt mid line.²¹

There is a complex of ruptures in the text when, at the end of the ekphrasis, Daedalus fails to sculpt Icarus. First, the apostrophe breaks the communication between the narrator and the reader. The shift in addressee leaves the reader out. Second, there is a break in the correspondence between the object of the ekphrasis and the description.²² No longer do the words explain what is there, but instead they explain what is not there. Third, there is a shift in focalization. The ekphrasis begins when Aeneas sees the doors and the narrator speaks what Aeneas sees. The apostrophe, however, cannot be focalized through Aeneas since Aeneas does not see what is not there. The focalization shifts back to Aeneas quickly (again in the middle of a line) when the Sibyl interrupts his viewing (*Aeneid* 6.33–37). The Sibyl interrupts for Aeneas what the text has already broken off for the reader, revealing the break between Aeneas's viewing experience and that of the reader. Finally and most importantly, there is a break between what Daedalus means to represent and the sculpture itself.²³ The text does not match the artist's intention.²⁴

Within the context of an ekphrasis, a form involving inherent narrative discontinuity, the story of Daedalus and Icarus makes a link between semantic and familial discontinuity. This is not merely a juxtaposition, but also a causal connection. The failure of signification is a direct result of the death of Icarus. Moreover, this connection must also apply to the *Aeneid* as a whole. Scholars have noted the parallels between Daedalus's sculpture and Virgil's poem (Putnam 1998, 75–96). Especially noteworthy here are the premature deaths of sons and the abrupt end of

the poem at one such death (Putnam 1998, 95). Daedalus's art self-reflexively addresses the impossibility of representing a world broken by death.

The world broken by death is what appears in the nighttown of "Circe" when the ghost of Rudy appears and disrupts the relationship between Bloom and Dedalus. The resurgence of the ghost of Rudy and Bloom's mourning for his dead son disrupt Bloom's attempt to repair the disconnect between Stephen Dedalus and his father, Simon. "Circe" capitalizes on the name of Dedalus when Stephen, upon entering the brothel, lays claim to the Greek ancestry of his name: "Queens lay with prize bulls. Remember Pasiphae for whose lust my grandoldgrossfather made the first confessionbox" (*Ulysses* 15.3865–3867, also see above, chapter 4). Stephen, the artist of Joyce's *Portrait*, is also Daedalus, the artist of the temple doors that open *Aeneid* 6, and both artist and doors thematize familial breakage. In the *Aeneid* and in "Circe" the art of Daedalus/Dedalus fails to repair the connection between father and dead son. The dynamics are complex, but the connection between "Circe" and *Aeneid* 6 emphasizes for readers of Virgil the connections between discontinuities of patrilineal succession and discontinuities of artistic representation. Both episodes play out on the level of form the failure of fatherhood in mourning for the dead son.

Semantic Discontinuity: The Sibyl's Prophecy

Following the opening ekphrasis, Aeneas enters the temple and speaks with the Sibyl. Here, the discontinuity of signification continues, and the words of the Sibyl, like Daedalus's art, fail to communicate a meaning. The poem destabilizes language itself, opening a space between the signifier and its referent. To some extent, this is not unusual for a prophecy in the *Aeneid*, since a prophecy as an act of communication between a speaker and an immediate audience within the narrative almost always fails.²⁵ The recipient of a prophecy almost never understands the meaning immediately, mistaking the true referent of one important element or another.²⁶ While a reader with knowledge of the subsequent narrative understands the prophecies of the *Aeneid* in one way, the characters within the poem understand them in another. The possibility of multiple readings of a narrative of the future calls into question the stability of meaning in language. Nevertheless, in the case of many prophecies, there is a true meaning that the audience perceives, and the alternate readings of the characters are mistaken.²⁷ The existence of a true meaning reestablishes the threatened stability of signification. In the case of the Sibyl's prophecy, however, the poem's reflections on the medium of its

delivery question the existence of true meaning in prophecy.²⁸ The Sibyl's prophecy opens a space between text and meaning, revealing semantic discontinuity.

The poem's concern with the medium and the meaning of the Sibyl's book 6 prophecy actually begins long before its content is revealed. In book 3, the Trojan prophet and priest of Apollo, Helenus, advises Aeneas that when he comes to the Italian town of Cumae he should visit the temple of Apollo and consult the Sibyl. Helenus expresses his concerns about the medium of the prophecy. He warns Aeneas that he should ask the Sibyl to sing her prophecy directly to him, as her usual practice of writing will result in confusion:

huc ubi delatus Cumaeam accesseris urbem
divinosque lacus et Averno sonantia silvis,
insanam vatem aspices, quae rupe sub ima
fata canit foliisque notas et nomina mandat.
quaecumque in foliis descripsit carmina virgo
digerit in numerum atque antro seclusa relinquit:
illa manent immota locis neque ab ordine cedunt.
verum eadem, verso tenuis cum cardine ventus
impulit et teneras turbavit ianua frondes,
numquam deinde cavo volitantia prendere saxo
nec revocare situs aut iungere carmina curat.
inconsulti abeunt sedemque odere Sibyllae.

Aeneid 3.441–452

When, borne to this place, you will have reached the city of Cumae and the divine lakes and Avernus sounding in its groves, you will see a frenzied prophetess, who in a deep cave sings the fates and commits marks and names to leaves. Whatever songs the maiden has written on leaves she arranges in order and leaves closed up in a cave. Those things remain unmoved in their places and they do not move from their order. But those same things, when, with the hinge turned, a light breeze has stirred them and the door (when the hinge is turned) has shuffled the delicate leaves, then she never cares to catch the things fluttering in the hollow rock, nor to restore them to their place or join the verses. [Visitors] leave without receiving advice and they hate the home of the Sibyl.

What Helenus is concerned about is that the Sibyl's abandonment of her writing opens a space between her words and her intended meaning. Since she does not take care of her writing, the words can be mixed up. On the other hand, when she speaks,

her immediate presence eliminates the space in which the words become mixed up. Only when there is no space between the Sibyl and her words can Helenus guarantee that the text of the prophecy communicates her intention to Aeneas.

The concerns that Helenus expresses regarding the Sibyl's prophecy—namely, concerns over the failure to communicate her intention and the space that opens between the Sibyl and her words—are among the issues that Bhabha enumerates in his list of the “problematics” of postmodern and postcolonial thought. He cites “ambivalence,” “indeterminacy,” and “the status of intentionality” (248) as key issues raised by postcolonial and postmodern thought, but recognized as a “contra-modernity” within modern and colonial thought. The Sibyl's prophecy raises the same issues in Virgil's ancient epic. Bhabha, in his revision of Benedict Anderson, incorporates in particular Jacques Derrida's work on writing into the construction of the nation:

The heterogeneous structure of Derridean supplementarity in *writing* closely follows the agonistic, ambivalent movement between the pedagogical and performative that informs the nation's narrative address. (Bhabha 1994, 221, emphasis in original)

Bhabha here complicates Anderson's use of Walter Benjamin's “homogeneous, empty time” as the time of the nation by introducing a tension between the pedagogical aspect of the nation, in which the nation belongs in a linear narrative of history and grows from the legendary past, and the performative aspect, in which the people produce the nation simultaneously in the present. In the pedagogical aspect, the people are the object of discourse, while in the performative aspect they are the subject (Bhabha 1994, 209–219). For Bhabha, the ambivalence of the pedagogical and the performative in the discourse of nationalism follows the structure of Derridean supplementarity. In Derridean terms, Bhabha argues:

The sign temporalizes the iterative difference that circulates within language, of which meaning is made, but cannot be represented thematically within narrative as a homogeneous, empty time. Such a temporality is antithetical to the alterity of the sign which, in keeping with my account of the “supplementary question” of cultural signification, alienates the synchronicity of the imagined community. (Bhabha 1994, 227)

Bhabha's complication of Anderson ultimately arises from the “iterative difference” of language, making precisely the issues that Helenus identifies in the prophecy of the Sibyl characteristic of the discourse of nationalism.

Derrida, in much of his work but including especially his reading of Joyce in “*Ulysses* Gramophone,” argues that the “iterability” of language leads to a distrust of writing.²⁹ Certainly the idea that writing is unreliable or even meaningless is not a Virgilian innovation. Plato, for example, as Derrida argues in “Plato’s Pharmacy,” similarly dismisses writing as inferior to speech.³⁰ If, as Derrida argues in “Two Words for Joyce,” “Plato’s Pharmacy” is actually “an indirect reading” of Joyce (Derrida 1984, 150), then the scene of the Sibyl’s prophecy in the *Aeneid* sits between Plato and Joyce, anticipating Derrida’s reading of the two.³¹ The problem with writing, for Plato, Virgil, and Derrida reading Joyce, is that it functions in the absence of its author, but without the author to watch over it, a text is vulnerable to misreading.³² When the Sibyl speaks, she is present and able to adjust her discourse to the reactions of Aeneas, but if the Sibyl writes, her absence from the text threatens its meaning. The Sibyl does not care for her words once she has written them down, and she allows the wind to mix them up. Since the Sibyl no longer takes responsibility for her utterance, there is no way to recover the true meaning of the prophecy, and the recipient, in effect, receives no communication at all. As Helenus explains, “inconsulti abeunt” (“they leave without receiving advice”; *Aeneid* 3.452). When visitors receive written prophecies, these prophecies contain no meaning. When Helenus advises Aeneas to ensure that the Sibyl “ipsa canat” (“herself sings”; *Aeneid* 3.457), he suggests that in the case of oral communication, the presence of the Sibyl will guarantee that there is true meaning in the words. Aeneas may misunderstand, as he misunderstands most prophecies in the poem (O’Hara 1990), but at least the Sibyl’s intention will be present. Her written prophecies, on the other hand, no longer carry her intention; the true meaning has been erased from the text.

Helenus’s discussion of speech and writing in relation to the Sibyl carries implications for the whole of the *Aeneid* (O’Hara 1990, 176–184; Fowler 1997). Virgil begins his written poem with the words “Arma virumque cano” (“I sing arms and the man”; *Aeneid* 1.1). Virgil composed in writing, but the poem presents itself as an oral text. Fowler sums up the problem: “As song, the *Aeneid* aspires to transcend the indeterminacies of its nature as text, as written text it embodies those indeterminacies” (Fowler 1997, 269). Fowler argues that Virgil works through the issue of speech and writing in part by inserting surrogates for himself into his poem. For example, Virgil associates himself with the Sibyl. She is a *vates* (a poet/prophet), just as he is (he refers to himself as a *vates* at *Aeneid* 7.41);³³ and like Virgil, the Sibyl also sings by writing. So Aeneas’s fear that the Sibyl’s written prophecy will be unreadable is also Virgil’s fear that the *Aeneid* will be incomprehensible. Fowler, like Helenus, draws a distinction between written poetry, the meaning of which is indeterminate, and oral poetry, which greatly reduces indeterminacy.

The problem of the indeterminacy of meaning in written text is a problem for the *Aeneid* as a whole, and the poem discusses the problem most explicitly and most thoroughly in relation to the Sibyl's prophecy.

At first glance, Helenus seems to view the problem of the absence of true meaning from writing as solvable by speech. Even when the Sibyl sings aloud, however, Aeneas does not understand her. Aeneas responds to the prophecy, "non ulla laborum, / o virgo, nova mi facies inopinave surgit; / omnia praecepi atque animo mecum ante peregi" ("no new or unanticipated labor, maiden, rises before me; I foresaw everything and went through it before in my mind"; *Aeneid* 6.103–105). The Sibyl only communicates to Aeneas what he already knows. No new information passes to him. In effect, she fails to communicate at all. Helenus warned that those who visit the Sibyl *inconsulti abeunt* ("leave without receiving advice"; *Aeneid* 3.452). Even though Aeneas gets the Sibyl to sing aloud, he too leaves without receiving her advice.

In the *Aeneid*, the Sibyl's oral song fails to solve the problem of indeterminacy in writing, and Derrida also argues that speech falls victim to the same problem as writing.³⁴ Writing allows utterances to be removed from their original contexts, and the possibility of "taking words out of context" makes their meanings unstable. Derrida, however, argues that the possibility of taking words out of context is a necessary condition not only of writing, but of all linguistic communication and, ultimately, of all signification. The necessary possibility of citation (or, for that matter, allusion), a use that removes a unit of language from its specific context, makes all language fall into the category of writing. Like writing, by virtue of its "iterability" (Derrida 1988a, 18), speech is not strictly tied to a context or situation that determines its meaning. The difference between speech and writing is therefore a difference in degree, not a difference in kind. Derrida is not arguing that speech and writing are the same thing, but rather that speech, like writing, is capable of functioning outside of its original context and thus in the absence of the author. Spoken words, too, may be taken out of context. This means that the seeming presence of the speaker in a given situation cannot guarantee that the original, ideal or intended meaning of the word is the same meaning that the listener understands. Words can refer to different meanings in different contexts, and even in the most rigorously defined context, there is a gap between the idea in the mind of the speaker or author and the words themselves. The absence of the author and the idea that makes writing untrustworthy also makes speech untrustworthy.

Helenus at least partially understands that merely asking the Sibyl to speak instead of reading her writing will not be enough. He not only instructs Aeneas to ask the Sibyl to communicate orally, but he also emphasizes that the Sibyl's intention should be present in her speech. He instructs Aeneas that he should request

“ipsa canat vocemque volens atque ora resolvat” (“that she herself sing and that willing, she open her mouth”; *Aeneid* 3.457). The reader’s attention naturally falls on the verb “canat” (“let her sing”), meaning that Aeneas should not let her write, but have her sing aloud. However, this reading of *canere* is problematic. Virgil begins his written poem with the words “Arma virumque cano” (“I sing arms and the man”; *Aeneid* 1.1), suggesting that it is possible to sing in writing. Additionally, Helenus associates *canere* with writing in reference to the Sibyl’s activity. When Helenus is describing the Sibyl’s habit, he describes her writing as a song: “fata canit foliisque notas et nomina mandat”; “quaecumque in foliis descripsit carmina virgo” (“she sings the fates and entrusts the marks and names to leaves”; “whatever songs the maiden has written on leaves”; *Aeneid* 3.444–445). Whether the Sibyl sings aloud and then writes the songs down or whether she, like Virgil, sings directly in writing, the activities of singing and writing are closely related. These examples show that the *Aeneid* associates the verb *canere* with writing. Moreover, the emphasis in Helenus’s line does not fall on the word “canat,” but rather on the first word of the line, “ipsa” (“herself”), and on the word in the center of the line, “volens” (“willing”). Helenus wants the Sibyl herself to speak and to speak willingly. In other words, he wants the Sibyl to be present to her text, maintaining the connection between her words and what she means to say.

In book 6, Aeneas follows Helenus’s instructions and says to the Sibyl, “Foliis tantum ne carmina manda, / ne turbata volent rapidis ludibria ventis: / ipsa canas oro” (“At least do not commit songs to leaves, lest they fly around as playthings disturbed by swift winds: sing, yourself, I beg you”; *Aeneid* 6.74–76).³⁵ He asks her not to write songs, but rather to sing, herself. Like Helenus, he places the emphasis on the opposition between writing and being present to the utterance. However, while the Sibyl does sing aloud, she fails to follow Aeneas’s request that she herself sing and, against Helenus’s wishes, she does not sing willingly. Her prophecies are ecstatic, as Apollo overcomes her resistance and possesses her:

At Phoebi nondum patiens immanis in antro
 bacchatur vates, magnum si pectore possit
 excussisse deum; tanto magis ille fatigat
 os rabidum, fera corda domans, fingitque premendo.
 ostia jamque domus patuere ingentia centum
 sponte sua vatisque ferunt responsa per auras

Aeneid 6.77–82

But not yet enduring Apollo, huge in the cave, the prophetess raves, if thus
 she might be able to shake off the great god from her heart; so much the

more does he weary her raving mouth, taming her wild heart, and with pressure he molds her. Now the hundred huge mouths of the house opened of their own will, and they bear the responses of the prophetess through the air.

Not only is the Sibyl clearly unwilling to speak, but she herself is absent to the speech. When Apollo finally takes possession of her body, the hundred mouths of the cave open of their own will. This is far from Helenus's hope that "ipsa canat vocemque volens atque ora resolvat" ("she herself sing and that willing, she open her mouth"; *Aeneid* 3.457). Contrary to Helenus's instructions and Aeneas's request, the Sibyl's intention is not present in her utterance.

As a result of the rupture between the Sibyl's intention and the text of her prophecy, she fails to communicate an idea to Aeneas. After hearing her prophecy Aeneas understands only what he already knows because the problem is not merely the indeterminate meaning of her utterance, but rather its absent meaning. Written text is no more unreliable or indeterminate than oral text because speech fails as well. The problem lies in language itself. There is a gap between signifier and referent that renders semantic communication discontinuous. The failure of the Sibyl's prophecy calls into question the whole poem's ability to signify, not because the poem is a written text, but because of the constitutive discontinuity of language in general.

Helenus's and Aeneas's anxieties about the Sibyl's written and oral prophecies are also self-reflexive discussions on the nature of language in general and poetic and prophetic utterances in particular. The idea that language is discontinuous also appears on the level of the content. One effect of the poem's idea of language on its content is ambiguity or polysemy. The space that opens between signifier and referent means that meaning is always multiple and uncertain. The nature of polysemy and indeterminacy on the level of the content of the *Aeneid* is a much-discussed topic that is not without controversy.³⁶ Central to the controversy are the terms "ambiguity," "polysemy," and "indeterminacy." There is a scholarly consensus that the *Aeneid* exhibits these features extensively, but there is debate about exactly what the terms mean in the context of Virgil's poetry.

A useful example to start with is Virgil's use of *cano* in the opening line of the *Aeneid*: "Arma virumque cano" ("I sing arms and the man"; *Aeneid* 1.1). Servius points out that the word is *polysemus*, arguing that it means, *laudo*, *divino*, and *canto* ("praise," "foresee," and "sing"), but argues that in the context of *Aeneid* 1.1 it means *canto* (Allen 1970, 214; Patterson 1987, 30; Galinsky 1992, 473n85; Thomas 2000, 384). "Polysemy," for Servius, means that the word may have more than one meaning, but it does not mean that a particular use of the word means more than one thing. Servius uses *ambiguus* in a sense more like modern uses of

“polysemy,” to indicate that an individual use of a word or passage has more than one meaning (Thomas 2000, 388–391). Karl Galinsky, starting with the evidence of Servius, argues that “ambiguity” and “polysemy” for Romans do not connote uncertainty, and therefore there is no “indeterminacy” involved in ambiguous or polysemous signification (Galinsky 1992; Galinsky 1996, 258). In the case of Servian polysemy, the indeterminacy is eliminated by context, and in the case of Servian ambiguity, the multiple meanings each point to a specific intention. Servian ambiguity makes meanings overdetermined rather than indeterminate. The chief advantage of Galinsky’s approach is that it emphasizes the positive and productive force of ambiguity rather than criticizing it as a lack of clarity. Martindale, however, argues that Servius’s uses of the terms “polysemy” and “ambiguity” are not necessarily the same as the uses of Virgil and his contemporaries, but are merely one stage in a long tradition of criticism and scholarship (Martindale 1993a, 122–123). Martindale, along with scholars including Perkell, Lyne, and Fowler, and using a variety of modern and postmodern approaches to ambiguity and polysemy, presents a more complex view, which remains open to indeterminacy (Lyne 1989; Martindale 1993a; Perkell 1994; Fowler 1997). Martindale’s preferred term, one that he takes from Derridean deconstruction, is “undecidability.”³⁷ This term preserves the positive and productive connotations of Galinsky’s use of Servius without the intentionalist limitations.

The disadvantages of an intentionalist model that seeks to eliminate indeterminacy in an effort to recover a specific intention even in ambiguity and polysemy are apparent in the *Aeneid*’s uses of *cano*. Servius argues that the word in the context of the first line means *canto* (sing or write poetry) rather than *laudo* (praise) or *divino* (foresee). In light of Helenus’s and Aeneas’s later requests that the Sibyl sing (*canat*) her prophecy, however, the meaning of *divino* retroactively attaches itself to the *cano* of the opening line. The connotation is strengthened by the poem’s reference to Virgil as a *vates* (poet-prophet; *Aeneid* 7.41). The presence of *divino* in the *cano* of the first line is neither Servian polysemy, since the specific context of the line eliminates the meaning, nor is it Servian ambiguity, since the context of the line does not point to multiple meanings. Instead, *cano*, to borrow a phrase from Martindale, “can be read polysemously because of this polyphony of echoes, suppressed voices partly, but only partly, released, generating shifts in register” (Martindale 1993a, 122). Martindale is discussing ambiguity “read under the sign of intertextuality,” but here the intratextual network of meaning functions in a similar manner. On the one hand, the *cano* of *Aeneid* 1.1 is a use, signifying the writing of poetry, but it is also, on the other hand, a citation of the later uses of the word that will problematize the written form of the poem and link it to the thoroughly ambiguous genre of prophecy.

There is a famous instance of ambiguity in the prophecy the Sibyl sings to Aeneas. As she describes the coming war, she informs him that: “alius Latio iam partus Achilles” (“another Achilles has already been born in Latium”; *Aeneid* 6.89). The Sibyl is describing the new enemy of the Trojans, Turnus. In the following books, however, Aeneas comes to resemble Achilles in several ways, while Turnus more closely resembles Hector (Kinsey 1979; Van Nortwick 1980; King 1982). Aeneas is now the victorious invader, while Turnus is the vanquished defender of his home. Aeneas becomes enraged when Turnus kills his young friend, Pallas, as Achilles became enraged when Hector killed Patroclus. In the immediate context of the Sibyl's prophecy, the second Achilles is Turnus, but in the larger context of the *Aeneid*, it is Aeneas who is another Achilles. One might, using Galinsky as a model, classify this as an example of Servian polysemy, since the second Achilles might refer to Turnus or Aeneas and readers may argue that Virgil intended one or the other. One might also categorize it as Servian ambiguity, since it seems reasonable to assume that Virgil intended that the second Achilles refer to both Aeneas and Turnus. Martindale would instead suggest that the referent is undecidable. Whatever the terms used to describe the ambiguity, however, what I want to stress is the experience of discontinuity. The lack of a clear, unique referent produces the jarring realization that one's initial reading was at least incomplete, if not incorrect. At first it seems clear that the second Achilles is Turnus, but further reading forces a revision.

There are countless examples of polysemy and ambiguity in the *Aeneid*, and this is not the place for a catalogue of specific instances or even general types.³⁸ My point here is that the anxieties Helenus and Aeneas express about the Sibyl are reflections on certain features of poetic language in general, and that the *Aeneid* exploits these features by producing meaning through ambiguity, polysemy, indeterminacy, and undecidability. Words necessarily signify many referents, and though context may reduce polysemy, it can never eliminate it. Moreover, context may also increase polysemy, as in the case of intertextual and intratextual allusion. Polysemy is a kind of semantic discontinuity, opening a space between signifier and signified, or between intention and reception. Aeneas seeks to close the gap by requesting the Sibyl's full presence at the moment of the prophecy, but, though she sings aloud, she cannot comply with the spirit of his request. The *Aeneid* expresses this semantic discontinuity on a metapoetic level, as Helenus and Aeneas discuss their anxiety about language, on the level of the content of the Sibyl's prophecy, as in the example of the second Achilles, and on the level of the content of the *Aeneid* itself, as in the example of the use of *cano*.

The figure that demonstrates the iterability of speech as well as writing in *Ulysses* is the gramophone. In particular, in the “Hades” episode, Bloom contemplates

the possibility of using a gramophone to record and remember the voices of the dead, as a photograph records the images of the dead:

Have a gramophone in every grave or keep it in the house. After dinner on a Sunday. Put on poor old greatgrandfather. Kraahraark! Hellohellohello amawfullyglad kraark awfullygladaseeagain hellohello amawf krpthsth. Remind you of the voice like the photograph reminds you of the face. (*Ulysses* 6.963–967, quoted in Derrida 1988b, 44)

The gramophone allows the dead to speak, but only as an aid to memory. The dead cannot respond, and as they repeat themselves over and over in a new context, the message degrades and the communication begins to fail. This repetition of words in new contexts, for Derrida, radically separates the signifier from the signified and makes language recorded in writing or as speech, and ultimately all language in general, an act of “memory and mourning” (Derrida 1988b, 44).

The gramophone reappears as a character outside the brothel in “Circe,” playing Frederic Weatherly’s 1892 hymn “The Holy City” (*Ulysses* 15.2115, 2170–2173; Gifford 1989, ad loc.). The hymn, as hymns often do, repeats lines:

Last night as I lay asleeping,
There came a dream so fair,
I stood in old Jerusalem
Before the temple there.
I heard the children singing,
And even as they sang,
Methought the voice of angels
From Heav’n in answer rang,
Methought the voice of angels
From Heav’n in answer rang,
Jerusalem, Jerusalem,
Lift up your gates and sing,
Hosanna in the highest,
Hosanna to your King.
quoted in Gifford 1989, ad 15.2115

In a dream of the distant past, the narrator of the hymn hears an exchange of song between the children and the angels, but it is an exchange (not a significant communication) that takes place in a memory in a dream. Moreover, the song in

"Circe" activates the "second coming of Elijah" and the accompanying "End of the World" (*Ulysses* 15.2175–2177). As in "Hades" the gramophone repeats words and phrases as a memory, but here it also looks forward to the second coming and the end of the world, repeating from the future as well as the past. The song of the prophecy of the second coming (of Elijah rather than Achilles this time) is a recording that repeats endlessly from the past and the future, and just as in "Hades," that recording degrades. The gramophone interrupts Elijah: "(drowning his voice) Whorusalaminyourhighhohhhh . . . (the disc rasps gratingly against the needle)" (*Ulysses* 15.2211–2212). The degradation of the repetition turns "Jerusalem" into "Whorusalam," appropriate to the new context in the brothel and nearly unrecognizable as the hymn. Like the Sibyl's words, which when she writes them down get mixed up and degrade the message, the gramophone of *Ulysses* makes speech, or rather oral song, unrecognizable.

"Circe" is an episode in which the past returns, but in a new context and with a new meaning. The gramophone from "Hades" returns in "Circe" as a strangely insistent speaking character that interrupts communication rather than communicating. In "Circe" in general, the return of the past and the anticipation of the future interrupt the narrative as the signifiers take on new meanings. While Anderson might view such breakdowns in linear temporality as problematic for the construction of the nation within homogeneous, empty time, for Bhabha such ambivalence and undecidability are precisely characteristic of the discourse of nationalism. As Joyce does in *Ulysses*, Virgil, in the *Aeneid*, repeats important signifiers in different contexts that problematize stable signification, and in the sixth book in the Sibyl's prophecy, Helenus's warnings come back to Aeneas in a way that defeats his strategy to demand the Sibyl's presence to her utterance. Like the greatgrandfather in the gramophone, the Sibyl's voice comes impersonally out of the cave, and in spite of Aeneas's attempts to avoid the degradation of the signal, the Sibyl can only repeat to Aeneas what he already knows, predicting an undecidable second coming of Achilles.

Historical Discontinuity: The Parade of Heroes

Aeneid 6 opens with a rupture between images and meaning on the doors of the temple of Apollo, and it continues with a rupture between words and meaning in the prophecy. When these two media fail, Aeneas announces his real purpose for the trip to Cumae: to see Anchises in the underworld. Pictures cannot show Aeneas what Daedalus wants them to show and words cannot tell

Aeneas what the Sibyl wants them to say, so now Aeneas acts. He will attempt to learn by seeing the future for himself. Indeed what the dead and the not-yet-living have to teach Aeneas is that, at least for Romans, actions trump representation. Anchises explains the lesson of the display:

tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento
(hae tibi erunt artes), pacique imponere morem,
parcere subiectis et debellare superbos.³⁹

Aeneid 6.847–853

You, Roman, remember to rule peoples with authority, these will be your
arts, to impose the custom for peace, to spare the conquered and battle
down the arrogant.

The arts of the Romans are not representation but action. Romans, according to Anchises, get straight to the thing itself. Nevertheless, the recourse to action does not solve the problem of discontinuity. In fact, the parade of heroes adds a new kind of discontinuity to the complex. The final hero, Marcellus, is not only a dead son, but also a dead heir. The Daedalus ekphrasis combines narrative, semantic, and familial discontinuity, and the parade (including especially Marcellus) joins political discontinuity to the other forms.

The first discontinuity in the parade of heroes is narrative discontinuity. Like ekphrasis, the scene in Elysium is a description that interrupts the narrative of the *Aeneid*.⁴⁰ The future history of Rome is only indirectly a subject of the *Aeneid*, and here it appears as description rather than narrative. The poem does not directly narrate Roman history (as does, for example, Ennius's *Annales* along with most of the pre-Virgilian tradition of Roman epic) but rather describes history within its narrative framework (Harrison 1991, xxiv; White 1993, 78–82; Thomas 2001, 36). Aeneas is an internal audience, and even he does not view history directly, but only views historical figures while Anchises alludes to their future actions. Although Anchises claims that the arts of Romans are actions rather than representations, here action is wrapped in multiple layers of representation, as the *Aeneid* represents Anchises describing the actions of others to Aeneas (Johnson 1976, 107–108; Feeney 1986, 15). As description rather than narrative, Anchises's Roman history not only disrupts the narrative flow of the *Aeneid*, but also takes an internally discontinuous form. The parade of heroes is not a smooth progression of historical events, but a discontinuous selection of vignettes. There is no connecting material between the images, and although the beginning of the sequence is roughly

chronological, even this soon breaks down.⁴¹ The first break in the chronology comes when Augustus appears following Romulus (*Aeneid* 6.788–808), and then a second when Pompey and Caesar follow Camillus (*Aeneid* 6.826–835). After the description of Pompey and Caesar, Anchises abandons chronology altogether and moves rapidly through a jumble of names before interrupting the parade to deliver his statement on the Roman arts (*Aeneid* 6.847–853). As a descriptive episode, the parade of heroes both interrupts the larger narrative of the *Aeneid* and internally refuses to organize itself by narrative principles. Anchises represents history in the form of a discontinuous selection of images.

If there is an organizing principle to the parade of heroes, it is “the continuity of the *gens*” (Feeney 1986, 5). The juxtaposition of Romulus and Augustus, for example, underlines the continuous line of the Julian *gens*. When Aeneas asks Anchises about the connection between the two Marcelli, he notes that in the underworld, chronology gives way to family:

quis, pater, ille, virum qui sic comitatur euntem?
filius, anne aliquis magna de stirpe nepotum?

Aeneid 6.863–864

Who, father, is that one, who so accompanies the man [the elder Marcellus]
as he goes? His son? Or is he another from his great line of descendants?

The proximity of the two Marcelli does not indicate a temporal relationship, since the younger could be the son or a more distant descendant of the elder, but rather indicates a familial relationship (Feeney 1986, 5). The primary importance of family in the scene, however, leads to ambiguity or polysemy. It is often unclear exactly which member or members of a *gens* Anchises is viewing. Feeney wonders, “Which Drusi does he mean in 824? Which Gracchi, which Scipiones in 842–843?” (Feeney 1986, 5). And even when the referent is clear, Anchises (or Virgil) may allude to others of the same name. The Brutus of *Aeneid* 6.817–823 is the killer of Tarquinius Superbus, but his name calls to mind the assassin of Caesar. Feeney argues that the effect of the ambiguity and allusion is to blur the lines between individuals in favor of the characteristics of the families they represent (Feeney 1986, 5). Even the funereal form of the procession of ancestors emphasizes that the continuity of the family overcomes the individual discontinuity of death.

Nevertheless, the passage disrupts the continuity of the family in several ways. First, there is a failure to connect between Aeneas and his father. When Aeneas attempts to embrace Anchises upon meeting him, he finds that he cannot:

ter conatus ibi collo dare brachia circum;
ter frustra comprehensa manus effugit imago,
par levibus ventis volucrique simillima somno.

Aeneid 6.700–703

There he tried three times to put his arms around his neck; three times
the image, grasped in vain, fled his hands, like light winds, like winged
sleep.

This failure to touch the ghost of Anchises is a part of a larger pattern of the discontinuity between the living and the dead, but here it has the additional significance of a missed connection between father and son. Elsewhere, Aeneas also fails to connect with the dead. The attempt to embrace Anchises verbally echoes Aeneas's similar triple attempt to embrace the dreamlike ghost of Creusa (*Aeneid* 2.792–794), and also fits with his failure to speak with the dead Dido (*Aeneid* 6.469–476). Aeneas simply does not belong with the dead. Charon's boat groans under his weight (*Aeneid* 6.413–414),⁴² and Aeneas leaves the underworld through the ivory gate of false dreams (*Aeneid* 6.893–899), which at the very least points to his status as not a "true shade."⁴³ But Aeneas's failure to connect with Anchises is not simply a matter of his not belonging among the dead. Though Anchises attempts to teach his son about duty and the Roman future, Aeneas does not learn his lessons. Anchises's history is cryptic and allusive even for the most informed reader, and Aeneas could not possibly understand his references. Moreover, Aeneas in the end fails to follow Anchises's direct instruction to *parcere subiectis* ("spare the conquered"; *Aeneid* 6.853), when he kills the suppliant Turnus (*Aeneid* 12.930–952).⁴⁴ Though Aeneas does meet with his dead father, he fails to connect with him both physically and pedagogically.

It is not only Aeneas and Anchises who display familial discontinuity in the parade of heroes. The episode contains both overt and covert references to familial violence and civil war (Feeney 1986, 9–14). The instances of familial strife in Roman history not only display familial discontinuity, but also link it to political discontinuity. Two examples stand out. First, Brutus not only overthrows the Tarquins, but follows this up by executing his sons:

vis et Tarquinius reges animamque superbam
ultoris Bruti, fascisque videre receptos?
consulis imperium hic primus saevasque securis
accipiet, natosque pater nova bella moventis
ad poenam pulchra pro libertate vocabit,

infelix, utcumque ferent ea facta minores;
vincet amor patriae laudumque immensa cupido.

Aeneid 6.817–823

Do you also want to see the Tarquin kings and the proud spirit of the avenger Brutus, and the fasces taken up? This one first will receive the authority of a consul and the savage axes, and he, a father, will call his sons, who will provoke new war, to punishment for the sake of beautiful liberty. Unlucky, however his descendants will speak of the deeds. Love of country will conquer him, and a great desire for praise.

Rather than illustrating the continuity of the *gens*, this passage stresses its discontinuity (Feeney 1986, 10). The sons do not behave like the father, and they suffer premature death at his hand. Moreover, the first Brutus initiates political discontinuity by overthrowing the line of kings, and his sons initiate political discontinuity by provoking civil war. For Brutus, it is a political break that causes the familial rupture.

The link between familial and political discontinuity spreads to the Julian *gens* through Caesar. When Anchises describes Caesar he emphasizes the kinship ties between Caesar and Pompey, by referring to them as son-in-law and father-in-law, and between Caesar and himself, by calling the pair his descendants:

illae autem paribus quas fulgere cernis in armis,
concordes animae nunc et dum nocte prementur,
heu quantum inter se bellum, si lumina vitae
attigerint, quantas acies stragemque ciebunt,
aggeribus socer Alpinis atque arce Monoeci
descendens, gener adversis instructus Eois!
ne, pueri, ne tanta animis adsuescite bella
neu patriae validas in viscera vertite viris;
tuque prior, tu parce, genus qui ducis Olympo,
proice tela manu, sanguis meus!

Aeneid 6.826–835

Those two whom you see shining in matched arms, like-minded now while they are still held down by night, alas what war between them, if they attain the light of life, what great battle lines and destruction they will muster, the son-in-law coming down from the bulwarks of the Alps and the fortress of Monaco, the father-in-law having drawn up the Easterners against him! Do

not, children, do not accustom your spirits to such wars, do not turn the mighty strength of the country against its core. You first, you have mercy, who come from the race of Olympus, throw your weapons from your hand, my blood!

The political break between Caesar and Pompey is also a familial break between a father and son. Moreover, Caesar repeats the mistake of Aeneas, failing *parcere* ("to show mercy"; *Aeneid* 6.834) despite Anchises's instruction (Feeney 1986, 12).

The very fact of Anchises's instruction demonstrates Bhabha's distinction between the pedagogical and performative aspects of the nation (Bhabha 1994, 209–219). Anchises presents to Aeneas the people who will produce the nation as subjects in action as a spatialized historical narrative that makes them the object of pedagogy. The splitting of the people of the nation into subject and object is for Bhabha a profound undermining of narrative, language, and signification itself. The production of the nation is less a moment of continuity than one of discontinuity:

It is at this point in the narrative of national time that the unisonant discourse produces its collective identification of the people, not as some transcendent national identity, but in a language of doubleness that arises from the ambivalent splitting of the pedagogical and the performative. The people emerge in an uncanny moment of their present history as "a ghostly intimation of simultaneity across homogeneous empty time." The weight of the words of the national discourse comes from an "as-it-were ancestral Englishness." It is precisely this repetitive *time* of the alienating anterior—rather than origin—that Lévi-Strauss writes of, when, in explaining the "unconscious unity" of signification, he suggests that "language can only have arisen all at once. Things cannot have begun to *signify* gradually." In that sudden timelessness of "all at once," there is no synchrony but a temporal break, no simultaneity but a spatial disjunction. (Bhabha 1994, 228)⁴⁵

The disjunctive temporality of signification, like that of prophecy and fulfillment, which Anderson banishes from the homogeneous, empty time of the narrative form of the novel and the nation, nevertheless has a place in the production of the nation in the ambivalence of pedagogy and performance.

In the parade of heroes, *Aeneid* 6 seeks to construct a nation, or at least an ancient political identity analogous to a nation, and the apparently "unisonant" discourse of the nation rests not on continuity, but rather on Anchises's failure to connect with his son and more importantly on Marcellus's failure to continue the *gens*. *Aeneid* 6 brings the discontinuity of the family and of the political unity of

Italy to a head in the parade of heroes with the death of Marcellus. His death, at least in the *Aeneid*, ends both the Julian line and the political dynasty. The poem sets up a continuous patriline from Aeneas to Augustus, from the founder to the ultimate ruler. The premature death of Marcellus, however, “shattered dynastic plans.”⁴⁶ Although historically the dynasty did not, in fact, end with the death of Marcellus, thematically in the *Aeneid* it does. The poem offers no replacement for Marcellus. Once the poem has linked political continuity with familial continuity through patrilineal succession, one death interrupts them both.

The link between political and familial continuity interrupted by the death of Marcellus is what Joyce activates when he repeats the death of Marcellus in the death of Rudy. As I showed in the previous chapter, “Circe” thematizes the connections and missed connections between fathers and sons, including Bloom and his father, Bloom and his son, Stephen and his father, and Stephen and Bloom. These connections and failures to connect become political when Bloom envisions his future as the emperor of Ireland, making his family the key to the political continuity of postcolonial succession, and the foreboding vision of the looming civil war confirms the divisive political consequences of the death of the son and heir.

The parade of heroes directly links familial and political discontinuity. The link forms against a background of narrative discontinuity, since the parade acts as a descriptive or ekphrastic interruption, and against a background of historical discontinuity, since Anchises describes Roman history in the form of disjointed and disordered images. The complex of discontinuities in the parade of heroes is an appropriate close to the book that opens with the Daedalus ekphrasis. The description of the temple doors also disrupts the narrative with a description of disjointed scenes, and the content of those scenes connects familial discontinuity with semantic discontinuity as Daedalus fails to represent his son's death. Framed by the Daedalus ekphrasis and the parade of heroes, the Sibyl's prophecy brings the theme of discontinuity to its most fundamental level, discussing and demonstrating the rupture between words and meaning. *Aeneid* 6 represents a continuous chain of discontinuity from basic semantic discontinuity, to the narrative discontinuity of description, to the familial discontinuity of death, and finally to the historical and political discontinuity of civil war and the failure of patrilineal succession. Fowler notes, thinking especially of Conte, the easy slippage in *Aeneid* scholarship between discussions of narrative form and political content. He explains his belief in a “link between textual and political integration.”⁴⁷ This link is the same link that Jameson makes between the political realities of imperialism and the innovative and defamiliarizing techniques of modernist poetics. Moreover, it is the link the Bhabha makes between the ambivalent discourse of the nation and the Derridean iterability of the sign.

It is this narrative and political discontinuity of the *Aeneid* that Joyce exploits in the “Circe” episode of *Ulysses*. When the death of Rudy and the appearance of his ghost at the end of the episode disrupt Bloom’s efforts to create familial and political continuity, *Ulysses* projects these discontinuities onto the *Aeneid*. What I have shown in this chapter is that *Ulysses* can do this because the discontinuities are already there. *Aeneid* 6 is a difficult text in ways very similar to the ways in which “Circe” is a difficult text, and while it would be easy to attribute its challenges to a modern reader’s lack of native fluency in Latin or native familiarity with Roman history, I have shown here that the problem lies in the narrative and semantic discontinuity of the book. The difficulty of “Circe” is what makes it so compelling, and the episode exemplifies what it is that also makes the *Aeneid* a compelling text for modern readers. With the inspiration of Joyce’s *Ulysses*, modern readers can see how Virgil’s poem prefigures the modernist and postmodernist poetics of discontinuous narrative. Although the *Aeneid* is a text that thematizes the continuity of Italy as a territory and the continuity of the Julian family from Aeneas to Augustus, Joyce’s use of *Aeneid* 6 in “Circe” reveals a poem in which ruptures of families and of language itself resist integration into continuity and meaning.

Conclusion

In 1953, six years after the initial publication of *Mimesis*, Erich Auerbach responded to some of the criticism the book had received from classical philologists:

I expected that the most serious objections against the train of thought in the book would come from the direction of classical philology, for ancient literature is treated in my book above all as a counter-example. According to the statement of the basic theme, I had to show what ancient literature does not possess. The one-sidedness that results from this can disturb and perhaps even offend a reader who is a philologist of ancient literature, and it could be moderated, but not altogether avoided. (Auerbach 2003, 559)

Mimesis is a grand history of Western literature from Homer to Virginia Woolf, and Auerbach, a Romance philologist, was not a specialist in ancient literature. Moreover, he wrote the book in Istanbul during the Second World War, without access to extensive library resources for research in the fields with which he was less familiar. His use of ancient epic as a counter-example meant that he was not directly interested in understanding ancient epic itself, but in using ancient epic as an other against which to define postclassical and modern literature. The resulting reading of Homer in the first chapter, “Odysseus’ Scar,” is provocative and justly famous, but it may be the case that classicists will recognize Homer in as much of what Auerbach says about Woolf as of what he says about Homer.

Histories and theories of comparative literature often use the ancient epic as a negative image of the modern novel, but as Auerbach suggested, such readings are often one-sided. For example, in “Epic and Novel,” Mikhail Bakhtin defines epic by its association with the absolute past and the novel by its association with the continuous present (Bakhtin 1981, 13–20). John Peradotto, however, notes that twenty years after “Epic and Novel,” Bakhtin was “calling the epic one among several aspects of the novelistic” (Peradotto 1990, 53n15). Peradotto continues, “In

any case, I would venture to say that close readers of Homer are far more likely to recognize the *Odyssey* in Bakhtin's characterization of the novel than in his account of epic" (Peradotto 1990, 53n15). Scholars like Auerbach and Bakhtin are interested in the modern, and they use the ancient not to understand the ancient itself, but to understand the modern. The same is true for Anderson's analysis of the cultural roots of nationalism. Anderson uses ancient states (or more extensively the dynastic states of pre-nationalist Europe) as counter-examples or negatives of modern nation-states. Scholars interested in antiquity, however, have found much in the culture of antiquity that resonates with Anderson's analysis of the cultural roots of modern nationalism. My point is that theories and histories that set up oppositions between epic and novel or ancient and modern will often find that the most interesting things they have to say about one will apply to the other as well. Comparative analysis of literature and culture makes it too easy to treat one of the objects of comparison negatively, as does Auerbach's ancient counter-example.

Classical allusion and intertextuality, along with classical reception studies, depend on an ability to do comparative analysis of literature while treating both (or all) objects of comparison positively and dynamically. A well-known example from within the tradition of Roman epic will help to demonstrate the point.¹ In a short passage of about a thousand lines, Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (13.623–14.582) narrates the same story as does the whole of Virgil's *Aeneid*, but Ovid narrates at length the parts of the story about which Virgil is brief, and Ovid passes quickly over the episodes that take up most of the *Aeneid*. While it is perfectly possible to read what scholars call "Ovid's *Aeneid*" without also reading Virgil's *Aeneid*, it almost goes without saying that it is better to read this passage of Ovid with Virgil in mind. The reverse is not quite as intuitive, but nevertheless true. It is possible to read Virgil's *Aeneid* without thinking of Ovid, but surely it produces a richer understanding of Virgil to read with Ovid in mind, if for no other reason than to understand better Virgil's selectivity in his narrative. Stephen Hinds suggests, in fact, that in addition to reading "Ovid's *Aeneid*" as a subsequent revision of Virgil's *Aeneid*, readers might just as productively understand Virgil's poem as a "hesitant precursor" of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (Hinds 1998, 106). Seen from this perspective, the later poem is not "Ovid's *Aeneid*," but instead the earlier poem is "Virgil's *Metamorphoses*." "Virgil's *Metamorphoses*" is a poem worth reading. While readers of the *Aeneid* could ignore the influence of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* on Virgil's *Aeneid*, the resulting reading would be impoverished.

In the example of "Ovid's *Aeneid*," Ovid specifically alludes to Virgil's *Aeneid*, but it is possible to read each text without consideration of this particular intertextual event. I have, for example, in my reading of Virgil's *Aeneid*, not taken this allusion into account. It would be impossible to read all of Virgil's intertextual

relations in all readings of Virgil. In a more general way, however, it may very well be impossible to read Virgil's *Aeneid* and Ovid's *Metamorphoses* without each other. Ovid, writing after Virgil, treats the *Aeneid* as an object to be respected, imitated, and surpassed. In doing so, Ovid constructs Virgil as an "old" poet, and conversely Virgil constructs Ovid as a "new" poet.² Ovid is forever a successor of Virgil and Virgil is forever a predecessor of Ovid. The status of Virgil's *Aeneid* as a "classic," and as the culmination of Latin epic in the so-called golden age of Latin literature, is a construction of tradition that implicitly involves an act of interpretation of both Virgil's poetry and Ovid's. The ubiquity and the virtual unavoidability of the construction of Virgil's *Aeneid* as a "classic" makes it impossible to recover an *Aeneid* that does not stand in relation to its successors, if indeed such a poem ever existed.³

I use the example of Ovid because the temporal proximity of Ovid to Virgil as well as the fact that they are both Roman poets makes it easy to accept the idea of mutual influence. The nearly two millennia between Virgil's time and that of Joyce as well as the differences in language, culture, and literary form make it more difficult to conceive of a mutual influence between the *Aeneid* and *Ulysses*. Nevertheless, the intertextual dynamic at play in the relation between Virgil's *Aeneid* and Joyce's *Ulysses* is not entirely different from the intertextual dynamic at play between Virgil's *Aeneid* and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. *Ulysses* participates in the construction of the *Aeneid* as "classical," while the *Aeneid* participates in the construction of *Ulysses* as "modernist." More specifically, while it is possible to read *Ulysses* without reference to the *Aeneid*, it would be difficult to argue that analyzing allusions to the *Aeneid* in *Ulysses* does not enrich our understanding of Joyce's novel. Similarly, it is possible to read the *Aeneid* without reference to *Ulysses*, but reading the *Aeneid* through *Ulysses* produces a richer understanding of the text. Instead of privileging the position of the "original" contemporary audience, readers of the *Aeneid* should welcome the influence of such intertexts as Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and Joyce's *Ulysses*.

These two issues—the influence of the *Aeneid* on *Ulysses* and that of *Ulysses* on the *Aeneid*—are not entirely distinct from one another. *Ulysses* and the *Aeneid* have an intertextual relationship, and reading intertextuality always involves reading at least two texts (Barchiesi 2001, 142). While it may be tempting to reduce or simplify the analysis of one text in favor of the other, a full analysis of allusion must take into account the complexity of both the model text and the alluding text. On the other hand, while the two directions of allusivity or intertextuality are related, they are not identical, and so they must be treated separately. As Hinds points out, "A case can be made that full dialogue is always an unattainable ideal—that it is ultimately *impossible* at any given moment in any given study of allusive

incorporation, *not* to privilege one of the two texts involved over the other” (Hinds 1998, 102–103). At times this book has privileged *Ulysses* as the alluding text, and at times it has privileged the *Aeneid* as the model text, but the main subject has been the relation between the two, and the aim has been to treat both positively and dynamically without fixing the meaning of either or defining one against the other. The result has been a reading that views Virgil’s ancient epic and Joyce’s modern novel less as representatives of an opposition between ancient and modern and more as partners in the literary construction of collective identity in the wake of crisis.

The readings of Virgil in this book are not the readings Joyce would have done. Joyce was no doubt a perceptive reader of Virgil, but he did not formulate his readings as scholarship. My readings of the literary reception of Virgil in *Ulysses* are from my own postmodern perspective rather than Joyce’s modern one.⁴ Whether we accept it, resist it, or enthusiastically embrace it, we live now in a postmodern world. Contemporary literary production, theory, and criticism display postmodern features that scholars must reckon with. Postmodernism, however, is not only concerned with the literature that postmodern authors write. We now see classical and modernist literature like Virgil’s *Aeneid* and Joyce’s *Ulysses* with postmodern eyes.⁵ Although Joyce published *Ulysses* in its entirety within two months of the end of the War of Independence, from our current vantage point we can read it as a postcolonial as well as colonial novel. It is, as Attridge and Howes (2000, 1) put it, semicolonial. Although Virgil wrote the *Aeneid* long before the invention of semicoloniality, it is nevertheless possible to read Virgil’s poetry as semicolonial, and to see the features and issues of nationalism in a poem from long before the invention of the nation. In fact, although it is very possible to read Virgil without thinking of Joyce at all, it may be impossible for a twenty-first century reader to read Virgil’s epic of Rome without seeing it through the lens of the reader’s own nationality. To the extent that postmodernism is intertwined with the global spread of nationalism, as Jameson and Bhabha argue, Virgil’s poetry is today ineluctably postmodern.

Although this book has been very specifically about Virgil’s *Aeneid* (and *Eclogue* 1) and Joyce’s *Ulysses*, it has larger implications concerning the role that the classical epic plays in the construction of the modern and postmodern. When Anderson and Chakrabarty, relying on Benjamin, define the nation as modern, they define it against the ancient. The cultural roots of the nation lie in the novel as opposed to the epic, and in using ancient epic to construct a modern national culture, Joyce converts epic into novel, demythologizing the mythical past (Kiberd 1995, 327–355). In appropriating and incorporating Virgil’s epic, however, Joyce’s novel complicates the simple oppositions between epic and novel and between

empire and nation. The categories are not mutually exclusive, and as different as they are, Virgil's ancient epic of the Roman empire and Joyce's modern novel of the Irish nation share similarities as important as their differences. Those similarities as they are revealed through allusion and intertextuality have formed the core of this book, disturbing rigid oppositions between antiquity and modernity.

The first reason the modern nation of *Ulysses* shares important characteristics with the ancient empire of the *Aeneid* is that there are imperialist aspects of Irish nationalism. The character of the citizen, as I argue in chapter 2, through the allusion to Hercules and Cacus in *Aeneid* 8, bears traces not only of the violent terrorist, but also of the oppressive monarch. The citizen would claim a place as one among equals in a democratic state, but the allusion to the *Aeneid* suggests that his oppressive agenda of Irish purity is tyrannical. Virgil's Cacus, a model for the citizen, is an example of a "bad king" from whose tyranny Hercules liberates Pallanteum.⁶ In "Circe," as I argue in chapter 4, it is not the citizen but Bloom who becomes the monarch of an Irish empire. And even if Bloom's imperial aspirations were not explicit, the allusion to *Aeneid* 6 aligning Bloom with Aeneas and Rudy with Marcellus makes the Bloom family an Irish dynasty. In "Cyclops" and in "Circe" the emergence of the postcolonial Irish nation-state bears traces of imperialism.

The second reason for the analogy between the nationalism of *Ulysses* and the imperialism of the *Aeneid* is that there are nationalist aspects of Augustan ideology. The *Aeneid*'s projection of civil war onto the ancient past as a way of naturalizing the unification of Italy, as I argue in chapter 3, is an instance of the "reassurance of fratricide," a common feature of modern nationalisms (Anderson 2006, 199–203). Augustan reforms like the division of Italy into bounded geographical districts and the institution of local voting by district transformed Rome from an imperial city into a territorial Italian state (Nicolet 1991, 173–202). These reforms made it possible for Virgil to ground his construction of Roman identity in an association with a specifically bounded geographical space. Such a construction of identity based on a territorial association is a new development for Rome, but virtually universal for modern nationalisms. Moreover, the narrative, semantic, familial, and political discontinuities of *Aeneid* 6, as I argue in chapter 5, reflect the hesitations and uncertainties characteristic of emerging national identities. Though nationalists tendentiously claim ancient and stable collective identities, the political upheaval that produces the nation-state also produces divided and discontinuous identities. Although the *Aeneid* is a poem of ancient empire, it shares enough characteristics with the literature of modern nations to make it a useful reference point for the Irish nationalism of *Ulysses*.

The political character of the allusions to the *Aeneid* in *Ulysses* invites a political reading. *Ulysses*, the novel of the emerging postcolonial Irish nation, alludes to the

Aeneid, the epic of the emerging Augustan empire. In doing so, *Ulysses* both asserts the novelty of Joyce's nation against the antiquity of Virgil's empire and incorporates aspects of empire into the nation. The tyranny of the citizen and the dynasty of Bloom are imperial presences in the novel of the Irish nation. Reversing the direction, the political use of the *Aeneid* in *Ulysses* implies that aspects of the modern nation were already present in the ancient empire. The reassurance of fratricide and the persistence of discontinuity are characteristics of the nation in the epic of the Augustan empire. The intertextuality between the *Aeneid* and *Ulysses* simultaneously establishes and destabilizes the oppositions between ancient and modern, Roman and Irish, epic and novel, and empire and nation. The interpenetration of intertextuality makes it possible not only to pair Virgil's epic with the Roman empire and Joyce's novel with the Irish nation, but also to join nationalism and imperialism in Virgil's *Aeneid* and Joyce's *Ulysses*.

Notes

Introduction

1. Anderson (2006, 4). See also Hobsbawm (1990, 9–10).
2. On classical reception in national cultures, see especially Stephens and Vasunia (2010).
3. Toll (1997, 34n1), Syed (2005, 220–221), and Fletcher (2014, 4) specifically cite Anderson. See also Reed (2007).
4. Hobsbawm (1990, 9–10); Anderson (2006, 1–7, 11–12). For an alternate analysis of the modernity of nationalism, arguing that the association of nationalism with modernity is complicit in a teleological ideology of progress that presents colonized peoples as primitive, see Bhabha (1994, 203), who cites also Chatterjee (1986, 17).
5. Giorgio Agamben roots his analysis of sovereignty in Rome, and on the importance of Augustus in particular; see Agamben (1998, 84 and 102) and Agamben (2005, 68), which stresses the significance of the funeral for Marcellus and the connection between mourning and sovereignty. On the connection between mourning and modern nationalism, see especially Anderson (2006, 9–11).
6. Except where otherwise noted, quotations of Virgil are from Mynors (1969) and translations are my own.
7. Of course simultaneity is possible in antiquity, but an example from ancient epic can help to illustrate the contrast. As Feeney (2014, 199–200) points out, when Telemachus cries and covers his eyes with his cloak as he hears Menelaus talk about Odysseus in *Odyssey* 4, there are four nights remaining before Telemachus and Odysseus meet in the hut of Eumaeus. When Odysseus cries and covers his face with his cloak as he hears Demodocus sing about him in *Odyssey* 8, there are four nights remaining before he meets with Telemachus in the hut of Eumaeus. The similarity between father and son is not just that they make the same gesture, but that they do so at the same time. The intricacy and small scale of this epic simultaneity can be contrasted with the large-scale simultaneity enabled by the homogeneous, empty time of the clock and calendar.
8. See in particular Benjamin (1968, 87–90); Chakrabarty (2000, 151–163); Anderson (2006, 23–39).
9. It is useful to compare here Bakhtin's essay "Epic and Novel," which defines epic by its relation to an absolute and closed past that stands in opposition to the novel's open ended present (Bakhtin 1981, 3–40). See also Kennedy (1997b, 150).
10. The distance between the story and its origin is similar in structure to the "aura" of "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction," which Benjamin describes as

“the unique phenomenon of a distance, no matter how close it may be” (Benjamin 1968, 222). Moreover, it is the distance covered by the “tiger’s leap” of historical materialism in “Theses on the Philosophy of History” (Benjamin 1968, 261).

11. Anderson (2006, 24). See also Bhabha (1994, 226–228).

12. On the complexity of Stephen’s artistic endeavor, see Mueller (2006, 187). Mueller notes in particular the mixture of the liberal arts and the craftsmanship of the forge, tracing the relationship in Joyce to his use of Ovid in the epigraph to the novel. Though the epigraph is not Virgilian, even in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* the aesthetic and political complexity of Joyce’s fiction appears through his use of classical Latin.

13. An exception to this rule is Allen (2010), who reads Joyce’s use of classical literature as an act of resistance.

14. See especially Hinds (1998, 47–51), with further literature.

15. Hinds (1998, 49n60) cites Martindale (1993, 3–4) and Barthes (1986, 54).

16. See especially Jauss (1970); Iser (1978); Fish (1980); Thompkins (1980); Jauss (1982); Iser (1989).

17. On recent developments in the field of “the classical tradition,” see especially Kallendorf (2007), and on the significance of a tradition of reception, see in particular Martindale (2007) and Budelmann and Haubold (2011). On the use of “tradition” and the reception of Virgil in particular, see Kennedy (1997a).

18. This statement, of course, is a simplification of an extreme view, but the idea that it is better to read classical literature with a classical mindset does lie behind some recent and influential classical scholarship. In chapter 5, for example, I discuss the controversy over “polysemy” and “ambiguity” in the *Aeneid*. In this debate, Galinsky (1992) takes the position that when reading Virgil it is better to understand “polysemy” and “ambiguity” as the ancients did. Against this position, see especially Martindale (1993a).

19. On the “pleasures” of allusion and intertextuality without a Bloomian struggle, see Yaeger (2007, 434). Freedman (2009, 85) cites and uses Yaeger in an analysis of Joyce’s use of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* in *Ulysses*.

20. There are a number of recent introductions and companions to reception studies within the discipline of classics, including especially Hardwick (2003), Martindale and Thomas (2006), Kallendorf (2007), and Hardwick and Stray (2011). These generally acknowledge the field’s debt to Iser (1978) and Jauss (1982). Martindale (1993b) is often cited as a provocation to theorizing reception in the discipline of classics.

21. Citations and quotations of *Ulysses* are from the Gabler edition, Joyce (1986), and use the chapter and line numbers from that text.

Chapter 1

Joyce’s “Aeolus” and the Semicolonial Virgil

1. *Ulysses* also explicitly names Virgil in chapter 14, noting in the “Oxen of the Sun” episode (on the idea that mares can be impregnated by the wind), “As Virgilius saith” (*Ulysses* 14.244). This refers to *Georgics* 3.272–275. I do not in this book deal extensively with this reference, but see Schork (1997, 121).

2. For a more recent example of the use of Virgil's politics to make sense of Irish politics, see Hardwick (2007, 314–320) on Seamus Heaney's use of the "*Georgics* of resistance."
3. On the Gaelic or Irish Revival, see especially Castle (2001).
4. On Joyce's extensive use of Latin throughout his career, see especially Senn (1989a), Senn (1989b), Schork (1997), Arkins (1999, 4–5), and Mueller (2006). Mueller in particular emphasizes how integral Latin was to Joyce's aesthetic theory and artistic practice.
5. A major renovation of the Dublin sewer system begun in 1900 and completed in 1906 was underway during this conversation set in 1904 (O'Brien 1982, 124–125).
6. Gifford (1989, ad loc.) attributes the coinage to Theophrastus. The ancient source for this is Diogenes Laertius's life of Theophrastus (5.2.40). Plutarch's life of Antony (28.1) attributes the sentiment to Antiphon.
7. On the scholarly linkage of vowel loss with the "downfall of a nationality" as a demonstration of the superiority of Greece over Rome, see Habinek (1998, 20).
8. I owe the observation of the pun to one of the anonymous readers for the University of Wisconsin Press.
9. Platt (1998) recognizes Stephen's story as a parable of the nationalist struggle, but the political scholarship on the story, in failing to recognize the importance of *Eclogue* 1, does not see the importance of the land issue. In contrast, Senn (1989a) recognizes the importance of the *Eclogue*, but by passing over the political significance of the story similarly does not recognize the importance of the land issue.
10. On the colonial desire to take the place of the conqueror, see Fanon (1963, 157); Bhabha (1994, 63–70).
11. Recent discussions of global geography in the first *Eclogue* include Jones (2011, 44) and Saunders (2008, 59–72), who note in particular that Tityrus's and Meliboeus's images of far-flung places imagine Rome at the center of the world.
12. On this difficult word, see Wellesley (1968), cited in Saunders (2008). See also Clausen (1994, ad loc.).
13. On the importance of the Social War in the *Aeneid*, see Barchiesi (2008); Marincola (2010).
14. See, e.g., Fredricksmeier (1966).
15. For "pessimistic" readings of *Eclogue* 1, see especially Putnam (1970, 20–81) and Leach (1974, 113–142).

Chapter 2

Joyce's Citizen and Virgil's Cacus

1. For the case of Ireland in particular, see especially Said (1990, 75–79); Kiberd (1995, 9–25); Attridge and Howes (2000, 9). More generally, see Fanon (1963, 157); Bhabha (1994, 63–70); Chakrabarty (2000, 43). The roots of the idea may be traced to section 10 of Nietzsche's *On the Genealogy of Morality*.
2. Here I use the term "interpolation" (which means something different for Joyce scholars than it does for classicists) to mean passages in voices other than that of the nameless

narrator. The term does not connote an inauthentic or secondary status. In fact, it appears that Joyce began his work on “Cyclops” with the “interpolations” and added the narrative to them. On this topic, see Groden (1975).

3. I mean here the Galinsky of the 1960s. His more recent work moves away from the question of a pro-Augustan or anti-Augustan stance (Galinsky 1996, 4–5).

4. Translations and brackets are Schork’s.

5. See Gifford (1989, ad 12.1892) for the relation of this “H.R.H.” (his royal highness) to the historical crown prince in 1904, as well as full details on the various titles and offices of the character.

6. Cairns (1989, 29–57) contains a detailed analysis of the opposition between the good king Aeneas and the bad queen Dido, and 58–84 contains a similarly detailed analysis of the good king Aeneas and the bad king Turnus.

7. Joyce’s use of Ovid is extensive, and to the extent that the number of specific allusions to Roman authors in Joyce’s fiction is quantifiable, Ovid is second only to Virgil (Schork 1997, 289–307). For the most part, analysis of Joyce’s use of Ovid remains to be done, though Senn (1989b), Schork (1997, 154–183), Mueller (2006), and Freedman (2009) have made a good start. Cynthia Hornbeck has also presented a portion of ongoing work on Ovid and Joyce as “Working Women Weaving Tales in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* and James Joyce’s *Finnegans Wake*” at the 2014 meeting of the American Philological Association.

8. Ellmann (1972, 186–187) reproduces the “schema” for *Ulysses* Joyce gave to Carlo Linati in 1920.

9. Senn (1989b, 565–566). Senn also points out that Ellmann (1972, 111) notes the name Galatea but cites only Handel’s *Acis and Galatea* as the source.

10. Senn (1989b, 570–574). See also Farrell (1992, 246).

11. Senn (1989b, 568). Translation is Senn’s.

12. Schork (1997, 41–42) shows that Joyce knew the first book of Livy (though only book 5 was required for his Latin exams) by quoting from *Ulysses* “*Bloom with his scepter strikes down poppies. The instantaneous deaths of many powerful enemies . . . are reported*” (*Ulysses* 15.1565–1568), which alludes to Tarquin’s use of poppy decapitation to communicate execution orders in Livy 1.54–58.

13. Farrell (1992, 248) notes that some of this sympathy is also present at *Odyssey* 9.447–460, when Polyphemus addresses the ram under which Odysseus is escaping the cave.

14. It is worth noting that at the time Joyce was writing “Cyclops” much of Dublin had been demolished, not by elemental forces, but by the fighting in the War of Independence.

15. Allen (2010, 21) notes that “Cyclops” features a “vernacular classicism,” incorporating ancient epic into everyday life in the modern metropolis.

Chapter 3

The Virgilian Past of Nationalism

1. See above, chapter 1.

2. Syme (1939, 465–466). For more recent analyses of the relation between Virgil’s poetry and the unification of Italy, see Toll (1991); Toll (1997); Ando (2002).

3. There is much discussion on the unification of Italy. For a synthesis, see David (1996). Also see Crawford (1996). For a more controversial perspective, see Mouritsen (1998).
4. For the argument that the *Aeneid* represents the Latin War as a civil war, see especially Pöschl (1962, 14); Otis (1964, 315); Lyne (1987, 100); Cairns (1989, 92).
5. For the view of the war as a positive model, see Otis (1964, 317), and for the view of the war as a negative precedent, see Putnam (1965, 192). These arguments are part of the larger debate between those who view the *Aeneid*'s position on Augustus as primarily positive and those who view it as negative. For summaries of the debate, see Harrison (1990); Thomas (2001).
6. Ando (2002, 139–140) makes the point that Juno treats Italy as a whole in the course of his argument that the *Georgics* represent Italy as culturally homogeneous. He contrasts Virgil's view with that of Cicero, whom he argues posits Italian political unity but cultural diversity.
7. See, however, Toll (1997, 40), who argues, "The Italian peoples of the poem are endowed with vivid coloring and affection, but with very little institutional or even characterological detail." The lack of specificity in the descriptions of the Italian peoples not only allows Virgil's contemporary Italians to identify more readily with the cultural practices of the ancient Italians (which is Toll's point) but also prevents individual detail from distinguishing too much between communities.
8. See, however, Horsfall (1971), who argues that although Numanus seems to argue for the cultural unity of Italy, his description is too complex to represent an actual ideal.
9. Cairns (1989, 109–114) points out two similes that associate Turnus with Thrace (*Aeneid* 12.331–336, 12.365–367) and one that associates him with Carthage (*Aeneid* 12.4–8).
10. See also Reed (2007, 58), who notes that a simile linking Turnus with a tiger (9.730) and the three geographical similes of book 12 orientalize Turnus. Reed argues that not only does the alienation of Turnus imply Italian unity, but it also facilitates the union of Italians and Trojans.
11. See also a list of Roman cultural traits among the Italians in Toll (1997, 40). Toll includes the toga (*Aeneid* 1.282, 12.825) and the senate (*Aeneid* 8.105, 11.234–462).
12. Toll (1997, 44) cites Harrison (1977). Against Harrison, Toll argues that the foreignness and autochthony of Aeneas do not require any "juggling," but that the duality expresses the strange logic of Roman/Italian identity.
13. For the position that the *Aeneid* sets up oppositions between Italian and non-Italian specifically in order to destabilize the boundaries of inclusion in Roman identity, see Toll (1997, 48–50).
14. A familiar example of the reassurance of fratricide is the popular Northern description of the American Civil War as a war fought between brothers (Anderson 2006, 201–202). The story of the Civil War as a fratricidal one promotes the idea that the United States are naturally meant to be united. Had the Confederacy achieved independence, not only would our conception of the nation be different but the history of the war would be one of achieving independence, not one of temporarily divided unity. Though in the case of the American Civil War a nation-state existed before the war, what makes history represent the

war as civil is not that the state existed before the war, but that both sides were included in one nation after the war. The narrative of brother fighting brother is a way of reassuring Americans that the proper and natural outcome of the war was that the two temporarily independent states should be united as one nation.

15. Parry (1963, 68) compares Virgil's "feeling" for the "original Italian stock" with "what Americans have felt for the American Indian." Martindale (1993b, 42) points out the sinister aspects of both Virgil's poem and Parry's article, arguing that the article (as well as the poem) can be read as an "*apologia* for Empire" in its admiration of Virgil's melancholy treatment of the "lonely burden" of Empire.

16. For a survey of the origins of the legend, see Gruen (1992, 6–51) with further literature.

17. Gruen (1992, 44) cites Pausanias and Pyrrhus's coin issue featuring Thetis and Achilles as evidence for this.

18. We can reconstruct the account from fragments mostly in Servius. See also Gotoff (1984); Heinze (1993, 171–82). I choose the example of Cato here because, in contrast to the fragments of Ennius and Naevius, the account is relatively full and detailed.

19. Livy 1.1–2. See also Dionysius of Halicarnassus 1.57.

20. Anderson (2006, 201) points out that for Renan the reassurance of fratricide does not apply, for example, in the case of the Paris Commune, since "in 1882 its memory was still real rather than mythic." This point not only fits with the representation of Actium as a foreign war but also fits the erasure of the fratricide of Romulus, since the obviousness of the mythic parallel and the ubiquity of the imagery of the twins make this "myth" sufficiently "real," overriding the reassurance of fratricide.

21. Bhabha, too, characterizes nationalist dealings with the past in terms of mourning. He describes the past that is necessary for nationalism as a "ghostly return" that must be overcome or repressed (Bhabha 1994, 205–206).

22. I choose the death of Lausus as a representative example of a series of tragic deaths in the *Aeneid*. On structural and thematic links between the death of Lausus and other deaths in the *Aeneid*, see Otis (1964, 303); Tracy (1975); Reed (2007, 36–40). Otis places the death of Lausus in a chain that includes Marcellus, Pallas, Euryalus, and Camilla. Tracy elaborates on the parallels and adds discussions of Nisus, Mezentius, and Turnus. Reed discusses the connections between affect and national identity in the death scenes of Lausus, Euryalus, and Pallas especially. While the death of Lausus is a particularly rich example of the reassurance of fratricide in the *Aeneid*, the thematic connections between Lausus and Marcellus, Euryalus, Pallas, Camilla, and Turnus make possible similar analyses of all of these deaths.

23. On Virgilian innovation in the story of Mezentius, see Sullivan (1969); Gotoff (1984); Mackie (1991).

24. In contrast to this version of the story, Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. Rom.* 1.64–65) explains that three years after Aeneas and the Latins defeated the Rutulians, Mezentius attacked the Latins and Aeneas was killed in the battle. After some time during which Mezentius oppressed the Latins, Ascanius led a counterattack in which Lausus was

killed and Mezentius surrendered and was allowed to live. Virgil's version not only efficiently combines the wars against Turnus and Mezentius, but does so in a way that problematizes Mezentius's political identity.

25. There is much scholarship on the change in the character of Mezentius and the sympathy his last moments elicit. See Benario (1967); Sullivan (1969); Glenn (1972). Benario and Glenn complain of the lack of treatment of the character, but much work has been done since then. See especially Leach (1971); Putnam (1981); Gotoff (1984); Gaskin (1992). See also Conte (1986, 163–166), who argues that Mezentius does not, in fact, undergo a transformation (and especially not a dramatic one) but that his decision to die indicates an unwillingness to change.

26. The major manuscripts have *exitium* here and Mynors prints *exitium*, but Servius has *exsilium*, and Williams (1972, ad loc.) makes a good case for the reading.

27. Putnam (1981), however, takes a different view of Lausus's *pietas*, arguing that Aeneas's suggestion that *pietas* is harmful to Lausus (*Aeneid* 10.812) calls into question the heroic value of *pietas*.

28. The double nature of *pietas* as a duty to both father and country may be supported here by a verbal ambiguity. Though the context of the passage clearly identifies *patriae* as an adjective, one might also read it as a dative of the noun *patria*.

29. On Marcellus as the embodiment of Roman virtues, see Reed (2007, 155). On the special place of Marcellus in the parade of heroes, see Austin (1986); Feeney (1986); Reed (2007). Also on this topic, see Burke (1979); Habinek (1989); Brenk (1990).

30. I follow Williams's punctuation here. Mynors prints a comma. I prefer the exclamation mark because the breaking off of the condition mirrors the discontinuity of death on the level of syntax. Marcellus cannot “break through,” but instead breaks off, literally and syntactically, and the collective act of mourning overcomes the discontinuity of the break by means of the continuity of political identification.

31. Reed (2007, 155) argues that Marcellus is the embodiment of Roman “ethnic history.”

32. Anderson (2006, 198) cites the example of Jules Michelet, who counts as national heroes the “Frenchmen” who made of themselves “sacrifices” that enabled the future emergence of the French nation-state.

Chapter 4

Joyce's Rudy and Virgil's Marcellus

1. Schork (1997, 299). The order of this list is the order in which the allusions appear in “Circe.”

2. It is worth noting here that *Aeneid* 6 was a set text for Joyce's Latin examination at University College, Dublin, in 1899–1900, as Arkins (1999, 16) points out. Joyce also had a well-marked copy of the *Aeneid* in his library. For a list of the markings, see Gillespie (1986, 247–248). Finally, Stanford (1963, 276n6) notes that Joyce read Virgil while working on *Ulysses*.

3. It is also possibly significant that “Hades,” which takes place at 11 a.m., is the sixth episode of the novel, while the *nekuia* of the *Odyssey* occurs in book 11 and Aeneas’s journey through the underworld is in book 6 of the *Aeneid*, suggesting that both the *Odyssey* and the *Aeneid* are relevant models for “Hades.”

4. On the mirroring and reversal of book 1 in book 3 through the character of Shaun, see Smith (1986).

5. On the transitional aspect of the book and the shift in orientation from the past to the future, see especially Quint (1993, 79), as well as Clausen (1964, 145), who calls *Aeneid* 6 a “Janus-book.”

6. For the formulation of the turning point as a shift in orientation from the past to the future, see specially Kenner (1987, 127) on *Ulysses* and Quint (1993, 79); Clausen (1964, 145) for the *Aeneid*.

7. For the view of this passage as an optimistic or patriotic vision of the Augustan future, see especially Getty (1950); Williams (1964), and for the view that the passage rather disturbs or undermines its seeming optimistic political vision, see especially Feeney (1986); O’Hara (1990, 163–172).

8. For a psychoanalytical reading of Aeneas’s orientation toward the past in the underworld, see Quint (1993, 63–65), and for a more general analysis of the shift in orientation from the past to the future in Virgil’s underworld, see Otis (1964, 302–304); Clausen (1964, 145).

9. On the importance of family in the parade of heroes, see Feeney (1986).

10. On the optimism of the parade of heroes, see especially O’Hara (1990, 163–172), who argues that the optimism of the vision is ultimately undercut. Bloom’s optimistic vision also ends badly as he falls from grace, is subjected to a humiliating trial, and is executed (*Ulysses* 15.1752–1956). Another way in which the visions of “Circe” display the political future is through the Easter Rising of 1916. Nolan (1995, 131–138) argues that “Circe” is a representation of 1916. Since 1916 is the past for Joyce, but the future for June 16, 1904, it corresponds to the parade of heroes and its representation of a history that is past for Virgil, but future for Aeneas.

11. The “Gold Stick” at *Ulysses* 15.1438 may also allude to the golden bough. The case for the allusion is strengthened by the importance of the golden bough in the reception of the *Aeneid*. For an account of the history of that reception, see Ossa-Richardson (2008).

12. The Lion might also refer to a simile comparing Turnus to a Libyan lion (*Aeneid* 12.4–9), which in turn strengthens the connection to Dido because the *Aeneid*’s association of Turnus with Carthage points out the similarities between Turnus and Dido as tragically doomed enemies of Aeneas. On this simile and the connection to Dido, see Cairns (1989, 111–112); Lyne (1989, 162–165).

13. It is strange that Dido does not play a larger part in *Ulysses*. The vision that the *Aeneid* provides of a possible alternative world in which Rome and Carthage are unified with Dido and Aeneas as rulers suggests a parallel with Ireland and England, especially taking into account the dual monarchy model of Arthur Griffith. Another potential moment of intertextuality suggests itself in “Circe,” where the Circe character of Bella Cohen becomes a masculine (Bello) who effeminizes Bloom and detains him away from home, as the ruler

Dido threatens to effeminize the Trojan Aeneas and keep him from his new home. *Ulysses*, however, is much more interested in *Aeneid* 6 and 8 than it is in *Aeneid* 4 and Dido, who appears only infrequently.

14. On the uses of *Hamlet* in *Ulysses*, see Edwards (1950); Harkness (1975); Schutte (1957). On the theme of fathers and sons in *Hamlet*, see especially Rasmussen (1984); Erlich (1977).

15. Joyce is not the only reader to see the parallels between *Hamlet* and Aeneas's search for the ghost of his father. On the influence of the *Aeneid* on *Hamlet*, see Black (1994); Johnson (1986); Miola (1988).

16. On the workings of metempsychosis in *Aeneid* 6, with particular attention to Virgil's models, see especially Habinek (1989, 228–233), with further literature.

17. For the history of Marcellus, see Syme (1939, 341–348, 388–389) as well as Crook (1996, 81–87).

18. For an overview of the problem of succession, see Eder (1990, 120–122).

19. On the importance of family in the parade of heroes, see Feeney (1986), and on the succession of the Julian line in particular, see Getty (1950); Williams (1987, 36–40).

20. Mynors (1969) prints a comma here, but Williams (1972), and Austin (1986) make good arguments for the exclamation mark.

21. There is scholarly debate over the significance of the death of Marcellus. Some scholars argue that the tragedy of the death of Marcellus merely balances the success of Rome or even eliminates the threat of divine punishment for too much greatness. For this view, see Otis (1964, 303–304). Most scholars, on the other hand, find it more difficult to read the death of Marcellus as anything but a disaster for the future of the line. Williams (1983, 214), for example, calls Marcellus's death a "collapse" of the future. For a thorough survey of the debate with further literature, see Burke (1979, 228n36), or for a more recent but less comprehensive survey, see O'Hara (1990, 168n97).

22. Gifford (1989, ad 15.4966–4967). Gifford, however, takes this identification as evidence that Rudy is like Hermes.

23. There are three main scholarly positions in this debate. The most widely accepted suggestion is that Aeneas exits through the gate of false dreams because he, being alive, is not a true shade. For this position, see Tarrant (1982); Reed (1973, 313). The second explanation of Aeneas's exit is that Virgil does not really believe the underworld to be as he represents it, but indicates that this part of his poem is a fiction. For this position, see especially Otis (1964); West (1987). The third main argument is that the gate of false dreams casts doubt on the validity of the vision Aeneas sees in the underworld and particularly undermines Anchises's optimism about the Roman future. For this, see O'Hara (1990, 170–172).

24. The argument that the ivory cane calls into question the optimism of the episode is necessarily speculative. While the use of ivory in analogous positions in "Circe" and *Aeneid* 6 seems unlikely to be coincidental, it is impossible to prove whether or not Joyce read Aeneas's use of the ivory gate in *Aeneid* 6 as questioning the optimism of the episode. Certainly there was some speculation about the ivory gate in scholarship available to Joyce, including especially Norwood (1910), arguing that Aeneas by entering the underworld has

become a temporary subject of Hades and that by using the gate of ivory rather than the gate of the true subjects of Hades Aeneas releases the hold the underworld has on him. The association of the horn gate with the true subjects of Hades may be picked up in *Ulysses* by the undertaker's name, Corny Kelleher, which is reminiscent of the horn (*cornea*) gate. The specific argument that the use of the ivory gate undermines the optimism of the passage, however, appears in scholarship only after the publication of *Ulysses*. Nevertheless, given the connection between Rudy and Marcellus and the long-standing confusion over Aeneas's use of the ivory gate, it seems likely that Joyce means the ivory of Rudy's cane at least to introduce a problem if not specifically to undermine the optimism of the episode.

25. Ungar (2002, 53–54) makes the connection to Rudolf and has further details on the connections between the Blooms and the Hapsburgs.

26. Anchises predicts to Aeneas the “golden age” of Augustus at *Aeneid* 6.791–794.

27. See above, chapter 1.

28. Nadel (1990, 164). See also Duffy (1994, 133) on the connection between the formal “difficulty” of the episode and the problem of violence and postcoloniality.

29. The nationalist MacHugh, for example, makes the parallel between the Roman and British Empires in “Aeolus” (*Ulysses* 7.491). Also see above, introduction. For the parallel between Roman and British imperialism in Irish nationalist culture in general, see Platt (1998, 111–112). On the same parallel in British culture, see Vasunia (2005).

30. On the loss of a pure and nativist ideal in the cultural decolonization of Ireland, see Said (1990).

Chapter 5

Virgil's Joycean Poetics

1. Nolan (1995, 55–62). See also chapter 4, above.

2. Duffy (1994, 133). See also chapter 4, above.

3. Conte (1986, 153–167). See also Conte (2007, 150–169), “The Strategy of Contradiction,” arguing that criticism of the *Aeneid* is too reductive in its attempts to resolve and unify the poem.

4. See especially Putnam (1965); Lyne (1987); O'Hara (2006, 77–103). For summaries of the extensive debate between those who see the poem as supportive of Augustus and those who argue that the poem undermines its own support for Augustus, see Harrison (1990); Thomas (2001, 1–54).

5. Presumably Jameson is alluding to such arguments as Jameson (1981), although perhaps the clearest formulation of the overall structure of the argument is in Jameson (1991).

6. See above, introduction.

7. On problems and ruptures in the narrative continuity of the *Aeneid* in general, see Fowler (1997).

8. On ekphrasis as a disruption of narrative in the *Aeneid*, see Weber (1978); Barchiesi (1997); Putnam (1998, 1–22).

9. For the ruptures of narrative order in the *Aeneid* in prophecy in particular, see Mack (1978); O'Hara (1990).
10. On the parade of heroes as a disruption of continuity as well as ruptures of narrative order within the passage, see Feeney (1986); O'Hara (1990, 163–172).
11. I use the term “ekphrasis” in the restricted sense, meaning a description of a work of visual art in a work of literature, rather than in the more general sense of the visual power of words. For definitions and a general introduction to ekphrasis in Virgil, see Barchiesi (1997).
12. Putnam (1998, 82) argues that the Daedalus ekphrasis parallels both Virgil's career as a poet and the *Aeneid*. See also Putnam (1998, 74n1) for further literature, including especially Pöschl (1962, 104–105), who argues for the parallel between Aeneas and Daedalus.
13. Putnam (1998, 75) argues, “This is the only occasion in ancient literature where an artist is described as constructing his literal—which in this case is also to say his spiritual, or psychic—biography.”
14. For the relation of Daedalus's “failure” to the theme of fathers and sons, see Lee (1979, 162).
15. See especially Pöschl (1962); Pöschl (1975); Fowler (1991); Barchiesi (1997); Putnam (1998).
16. For the argument that ekphrasis is a matter of epic retardation, see Barchiesi (1997, 278–280). For the argument that ekphrasis represents generic interaction, see Putnam (1998, 3–7), although see also Otis (1964, 88–89, 93, 194) for the argument that ekphrasis is specifically a feature of epic. For the position that ekphrasis is a site of competing ideology, see Fowler (1991).
17. Paschalis (1986) points out that the death of Androgeos sets the tone for the remaining scenes, arguing that the “unifying theme” of the ekphrasis is premature death.
18. Austin (1986, ad loc.) notes that “the patronymic form [is] not recorded earlier.”
19. Otis (1964, 284); Segal (1965, 643); Rutledge (1971, 111) take the *regina* to mean Pasiphae rather than Ariadne, and Fitzgerald (1984, 56) argues that the reference is intentionally ambiguous. All note, however, that the scholarly consensus is with Ariadne, and see especially Paschalis (1986, 37), who argues that the reference is to Ariadne specifically because she fits better with the “unifying theme,” although for Paschalis this theme is not the interruption of family, but rather premature death.
20. Austin (1986, ad loc.) argues that the description of Daedalus and Ariadne is more likely not a new scene because the transition would be too abrupt. Putnam (1998, 80) notes the “abrupt changes” and suggests that the reader is “appropriately disoriented.”
21. Austin (1986, ad loc.) notes the “dramatic break” at the bucolic diaeresis and calls it an “emotional pause.” Thomas (2001, 264) suggests that the stoppage in the middle of a line is “unique in the history of ecphrasis.”
22. The correspondence between the words and the object is a significant problem for ekphrasis, and Virgil addresses the issue elsewhere. In book 8, for example, he describes the shield despite calling it a *non enarrabile textum* (“an indescribable text”; *Aeneid* 8.625).
23. Virgil is not the first to connect the failure of signification to the failure of a parent to care for a child. A particularly famous example of this connection (thanks in part to

Derrida [1981]) is in Plato's *Phaedrus*. Plato, however, uses the metaphor of an orphan. The dead father cannot care for the text and ensure that it communicates what he meant. In the *Aeneid*, it is not the death of the father that makes the text fail, but the death of the son. Reversing the metaphor, Virgil theorizes not the death of the author, but the death of the text itself.

24. On Joyce's reading of Daedalus as an artist, including his shortcomings, see especially Mueller (2006, 181–187).

25. See Potter (1994, 64–70) for an overview of prophecy in Roman literature, and O'Hara (1990) for prophecy in Virgil in particular. On the problem of meaning in literary prophecy, see Manetti (1993, 24–29). Manetti points out that in Greek and Roman literature human characters almost always misinterpret prophecy, and he constructs a typology of their errors. For the place of Virgil's use of the Sibyl in this typology, see Manetti (1993, 26n11).

26. O'Hara (1990) analyzes the prophecies of the poem and identifies a pattern of "optimistic" prophecies that conceal negative aspects of the future. While it is true that the recipients misunderstand the prophecies, one might argue that the systematic nature of the misunderstandings is itself a successful communication of a deliberate or intended idea. If so, the communication takes place outside the narrative, and Virgil's characters fail to perceive the pattern.

27. See, for example, Moore (1921) for the traditional argument that prophecy in ancient literature unifies the narrative by foreshadowing. According to Moore, the purpose of prophecy in epic is to give the audience a look ahead, eliminating suspense and linking multiple timeframes together. This view relies on the idea that prophecy is a stable, albeit secret, communication of a true meaning to the audience of the epic. More recent work, like O'Hara (1990); Fowler (1997), questions the stability of meaning in prophecy in the *Aeneid*.

28. On indeterminacy of meaning in relation to the opposition between written and oral media in the *Aeneid*, see Fowler (1997, 267–270).

29. This is a major theme in Derrida's work, beginning with Derrida (1976). I have found Derrida's clearest and most concise explanation of the argument to be Derrida (1988a). Particularly relevant here is Derrida's (1988b) "*Ulysses* Gramophone."

30. Derrida (1981). On Plato as source material for Virgil, and especially for *Aeneid* 6, see Solmsen (1972); Feeney (1986); West (1987), but on the dangers of relying too much on Platonic source material for interpretation of the book, see Habinek (1989).

31. On Derrida's reading of Plato as a precursor to his reading of Joyce, see also Derrida (1988b, 64).

32. Derrida (1981, 77, 114–15). See also Derrida (1976); Derrida (1988a). The absence of the author is, for Derrida, only the beginning of Western criticism of writing, since the "impotence" of writing would not be threatening if it were not a "dangerous supplement," which threatens to supplant speech. On writing as "dangerous supplement," see Derrida (1976, 141–164); Derrida (1981, 110).

33. On Virgil as a *vates* in the *Aeneid*, see O'Hara (1990, 176–184). On the *vates* more generally in Roman literature, see Dahlmann (1948); Newman (1967).

34. See especially Derrida (1976, 315); Derrida (1981, 168); Derrida (1984, 44–45); Derrida (1988a, 18).
35. Dyson (2001, 43–46) argues that Aeneas fails to follow precisely Helenus's instructions in making sacrifices, and attributes Aeneas's failure to appease Juno to this. It is possible that Aeneas has also failed in some way that affects his understanding of the prophecy, though he seems to follow Helenus's instructions in this particular matter closely.
36. For an overview of polysemy and indeterminacy in the *Aeneid* with further literature, see Thomas (2000). Also see especially Lyne (1989); Martindale (1993a); Galinsky (1994b); Perkell (1994); Fowler (1997); O'Hara (1997).
37. Martindale acknowledges his debt to Derrida and deMan, but does not cite a specific source for the term "undecidability." It is difficult, however, to borrow this term from deconstruction without alluding to Derrida (1981), which analyzes the undecidability of the *pharmakon*. It is interesting to note that for Derrida, in "Plato's Pharmacy" and elsewhere, undecidability is intimately linked with the problem of writing and speech.
38. For more exhaustive analysis of the types of ambiguity and polysemy in the *Aeneid*, see Martindale (1993a); Perkell (1994); Thomas (2000).
39. Putnam (1998, 75–76) notes the relevance of this passage to the Daedalus ekphrasis.
40. Habinek (1989), however, seeks to show the unity of Virgil's account of the underworld, reconciling the apparent philosophical and ideological contradictions. In this respect he argues against Feeney (1986), who seeks to show the incompatibility of the parade of heroes with the surrounding narrative.
41. On the lack of temporal order in the parade of heroes, see Burke (1979, 224).
42. Austin (1986, ad loc.) points out that Aeneas's weight is "most unghostly."
43. Tarrant (1982). See also Reed (1973, 313), who points out that the idea goes at least as far back as Deubner's 1866 edition of the *Aeneid*. I do not think that the idea that Aeneas and the Sibyl exit through the gate of false dreams because they are not true shades excludes the interpretation that the exit casts doubt on the truth of the visions of future Roman heroism, for which, see Otis (1964, 304); West (1987); O'Hara (1990, 170–72). Otis and West argue that the vision is literally false (i.e., Virgil does not believe the underworld is really as it is represented in the poem) but true in its optimistic spirit, while O'Hara argues that it is precisely the optimistic spirit that is false.
44. Putnam (1987, 193) points out Aeneas's failure to remember the specific instruction to be merciful. For a more general treatment of Aeneas's failure to remember Anchises at the end of the poem, see Most (2001). See also, however, Thomas (2001, 288–296) for a discussion of various critical and scholarly justifications of Aeneas's killing of Turnus. In particular, see Galinsky (1988); Cairns (1989, 82–84); Stahl (1990); Galinsky (1994a), all of whom argue that rather than "forgetting" at the end of the poem, the stress should be on "remembering" Turnus's villainy.
45. Bhabha takes the first quotation within this quotation from Anderson (2006, 145) and the second from Lévi-Strauss (1987, 58). The emphasis is Bhabha's.
46. Austin (1986, ad 868). Also see above, chapter 3.
47. Fowler (1991, 35) discusses Conte (1986).

Conclusion

1. I take this example from Hinds (1998, 104–107).
2. On the construction of “old” poets and “new” poets, see Hinds (1998, 52–98).
3. On the canonical status of Virgil as a “classic,” see especially Martindale (1997).
4. On the issue of a scholarly reading of a literary reception, see Martindale (1993b, 54).
5. An example of this is the success with which classicists have used Lacanian psychoanalysis. As Ellen Oliensis argues, psychoanalysis was not an “interloper, but a native plant with deep, ancient roots” (Oliensis 2009, 131).
6. On “good” and “bad” kings in the *Aeneid*, see Cairns (1989, 1–84), and on Cacus as a king, see Lyne (1989, 128–131).

Bibliography

- Agamben, Giorgio. 1998. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Translated by Daniel Heller-Roazen. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Agamben, Giorgio. 2005. *State of Exception*. Translated by Kevin Attell. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Allen, D. C. 1970. *Mysteriously Meant: The Rediscovery of Pagan Symbolism and Allegorical Interpretation in the Renaissance*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Allen, Nicholas. 2010. "'Out of eue sanscreed into oure erylant': Ireland, the Classics, and Independence." In *Classics and National Cultures*, edited by Susan A. Stephens and Phiroze Vasunia, 16–33. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Allen, Thomas W., ed. 1917. *Homeri Opera*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Anderson, Benedict. 2006. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London; New York: Verso.
- Ando, Clifford. 2002. "Vergil's Italy: Ethnography and Politics in First-Century Rome." In *Clio and the Poets: Augustan Poetry and the Traditions of Ancient Historiography*, edited by D. S. Levene and D. P. Nelis, 123–142. Leiden: Brill.
- Arkins, Brian. 1999. *Greek and Roman Themes in Joyce*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press.
- Attridge, Derek, ed. 2004. *James Joyce's Ulysses: A Casebook*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Attridge, Derek, and Marjorie Elizabeth Howes, eds. 2000. *Semicolonial Joyce*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Auerbach, Erich. 2003. *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*. Translated by Willard R. Trask. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Austin, R. G., ed. 1986. *Aeneidos Liber Sextus*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovich. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Edited by Michael Holquist, translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Barchiesi, Alessandro. 1984. *La traccia del modello: Effetti omerici nella narrazione virgiliana*. Pisa: Giardini.
- Barchiesi, Alessandro. 1997. "Virgilian Narrative: Ecphrasis." In *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*, edited by Charles Martindale, 271–281. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Barchiesi, Alessandro. 2001. *Speaking Volumes: Narrative and Intertext in Ovid and Other Latin Poets*. Translated by Matt Fox and Simone Marchesi. London: Duckworth.

Bibliography

- Barchiesi, Alessandro. 2008. "Bellum Italicum: L'unificazione dell'Italia nell'Eneide." In *Patria Diversis Gentibus Una? Unità Politica e Identità Etniche nell'Italia Antica: Atti Del Convegno Internazionale, Cividale Del Friuli, 20–22 Settembre 2007*, edited by G. Urso, 243–260. Pisa: ETS.
- Barthes, Roland. 1986. "The Death of the Author." In *The Rustle of Language*, translated by Richard Howard, 49–55. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Benario, Herbert W. 1967. "The Tenth Book of the *Aeneid*." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 98: 23–36.
- Benjamin, Walter. 1968. *Illuminations*. Translated by Harry Zohn. New York: Schocken.
- Bhabha, Homi. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Black, James. 1994. "Hamlet Hears Marlowe, Shakespeare Reads Virgil." *Renaissance and Reformation/Renaissance et Reforme* 18(4): 17–28.
- Bloom, Harold. 1997. *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brenk, Frederick E. 1990. "Purpureos Spargam Flores: A Greek Motif in the *Aeneid*." *Classical Quarterly* 40(1): 218–223.
- Budelmann, Felix, and Johannes Haubold. 2011. "Reception and Tradition." In *A Companion to Classical Receptions*, edited by Lorna Hardwick and Christopher Stray, 13–25. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Burke, Paul F. 1979. "Roman Rites for the Dead in *Aeneid* 6." *Classical Journal* 74(3): 220–228.
- Cairns, Francis. 1989. *Virgil's Augustan Epic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Campbell, Joseph. 1993. *A Skeleton Key to Finnegans Wake*. Cutchogue, NY: Buccaneer Books.
- Castle, Gregory. 2001. *Modernism and the Celtic Revival*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh. 2000. *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Chatterjee, Partha. 1986. *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse*. London: Zed Books.
- Cheng, Vincent John. 1995. *Joyce, Race, and Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clausen, Wendell. 1964. "An Interpretation of the *Aeneid*." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 68: 139–147.
- Clausen, Wendell. 1994. *Virgil Eclogues*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Clausen, Wendell. 2002. *Virgil's Aeneid: Decorum, Allusion, and Ideology*. Munich: Saur.
- Cohen, Jeffrey Jerome. 1996. "Monster Culture (Seven Theses)." In *Monster Theory: Reading Culture*, edited by Jeffrey Jerome Cohen, 3–25. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Conte, Gian Biagio. 1986. *The Rhetoric of Imitation*. Translated by C. Segal. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Conte, Gian Biagio. 2007. *The Poetry of Pathos*. Translated by Elaine Fantham, Glenn W. Most, and Stephen J. Harrison. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bibliography

- Crawford, Michael H. 1996. "Italy and Rome from Sulla to Augustus." In *Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. 10, edited by Alan K. Bowman, Edward Champlin, and Andrew Lintott, 414–433. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crook, John A. 1996. "Political History, 30 B.C. to A.D. 14." In *Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. 10, edited by Alan K. Bowman, Edward Champlin, and Andrew Lintott, 70–112. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dahlmann, Hellfried. 1948. "Vates." *Philologus* 97: 337–353.
- David, Jean-Michel. 1996. *The Roman Conquest of Italy*. Translated by Antonia Nevill. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Dawson, Hugh J. 1988. "Thomas MacGreevy and Joyce." *James Joyce Quarterly* 25: 305–321.
- Deming, Robert H., ed. 1970. *James Joyce: The Critical Heritage*. London: Routledge.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1976. *Of Grammatology*. Translated by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1981. *Dissemination*. Translated by Barbara Johnson. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1984. "Two Words for Joyce." In *Post-structuralist Joyce: Essays from the French*, edited by Derek Attridge and Daniel Ferrer, 145–159. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1988a. "Signature Event Context." Translated by Samuel Weber and Jeffrey Mehlman. In *Limited Inc.*, edited by Gerald Graff, 1–21. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1988b. "Ulysses Gramophone." Translated by Tina Kendall. In *James Joyce: The Augmented Ninth (Proceedings of the Ninth International James Joyce Symposium)*, edited by Bernard Benstock, 27–75. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.
- Duffy, Enda. 1994. *The Subaltern Ulysses*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Dunphy, Mark. 1983. "Joyce's 'Circe' Tribute to Apollinaire." *James Joyce Quarterly* 20(2): 231.
- Du Quesnay, Ian. 1981. "Vergil's First Eclogue." *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 3: 29–182.
- Dyson, Julia. 2001. *King of the Wood: The Sacrificial Victor in Virgil's Aeneid*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Eder, Walter. 1990. "Augustus and the Power of Tradition: The Augustan Principate as the Binding Link between Republic and Empire." In *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and His Principate*, edited by Kurt Raafaub and Mark Toher, 71–122. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Edmunds, Lowell. 2001. *Intertextuality and the Reading of Roman Poetry*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Edwards, Calvin. 1950. "The Hamlet Motif in Joyce's *Ulysses*." *Western Review* 15: 1–9.
- Eliot, T. S. 1985. "Ulysses, Order, and Myth." In *Critical Essays on James Joyce*, edited by Bernard Benstock. Boston: G. K. Hall.
- Ellmann, Richard. 1959. *James Joyce*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ellmann, Richard. 1972. *Ulysses on the Liffey*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bibliography

- Erlich, Avi. 1977. *Hamlet's Absent Father*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Fanon, Franz. 1963. *The Wretched of the Earth*. Translated by Constance Farrington. New York: Grove.
- Farrell, Joseph. 1992. "Dialogue of Genre's in Ovid's 'Lovesong of Polyphemus' (*Metamorphoses* 13.719–897)." *American Journal of Philology* 113(2): 235–268.
- Farrell, Joseph. 1997. "The Virgilian Intertext." In *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*, edited by Charles Martindale, 222–238. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Farrell, Joseph. 2001. *Latin Language and Latin Culture: From Ancient to Modern Times*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Farrell, Joseph. 2012. "Joyce and Modernist Latinity." In *Reception and the Classics: An Interdisciplinary Approach to the Classical Tradition*, edited by William Brockliss, Pramit Chaudhuri, Ayelet Haimson-Lushkov, and Katherine Wasdin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Feeney, Denis C. 1986. "History and Revelation in Vergil's Underworld." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 32: 1–24.
- Feeney, Denis C. 2007. *Caesar's Calendar: Ancient Time and the Beginnings of History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Feeney, Denis C. 2014. "First Similes in Epic." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 144(2): 189–228.
- Ferrer, Daniel. 1984. "Circe, Regret and Regression." In *Post-Structuralist Joyce: Essays from the French*, edited by Derek Attridge and Daniel Ferrer, 127–144. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fish, Stanley. 1980. *Is There a Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Fitzgerald, William. 1984. "Aeneas, Daedalus, and the Labyrinth." *Arethusa* 17: 51–65.
- Fletcher, Kristopher F. B. 2014. *Finding Italy: Travel, Colonization, and Nation in Vergil's Aeneid*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Fowler, Don. 1990. "Deviant Focalization in Virgil's *Aeneid*." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 36: 42–63.
- Fowler, Don. 1991. "Narrate and Describe: The Problem of Ecphrasis." *Journal of Roman Studies* 81: 25–35.
- Fowler, Don. 1997. "Virgilian Narrative: Story-Telling." In *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*, edited by Charles Martindale, 259–270. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fredricksmeier, Ernest A. 1966. "Octavian and the Unity of Virgil's First Eclogue." *Hermes* 94: 208–218.
- Freedman, Ariela. "The Metamorphoses of *Ulysses*." *Joyce Studies Annual* (2009): 67–88.
- Galinsky, Karl. 1966. "The Hercules-Cacus Episode in *Aeneid* VIII." *American Journal of Philology* 87: 18–51.
- Galinsky, G. Karl. 1988. "The Anger of Aeneas." *American Journal of Philology* 109: 321–348.
- Galinsky, G. Karl. 1992. "Venus, Polysemy, and the Ara Pacis Augustae." *American Journal of Archaeology* 96: 457–475.

Bibliography

- Galinsky, G. Karl. 1994a. "How to Be Philosophical about the End of the *Aeneid*." *Illinois Classical Studies* 19: 191–201.
- Galinsky, G. Karl. 1994b. "Reading Roman Poetry in the 1990s." *Classical Journal* 87: 297–309.
- Galinsky, G. Karl. 1996. *Augustan Culture: An Interpretive Introduction*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Gaskin, Richard. 1992. "Turnus, Mezentius and the Complexity of Virgil's *Aeneid*." *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* 6: 295–316.
- Getty, Robert J. 1950. "Romulus, Roma, and Augustus in the Sixth Book of the *Aeneid*." *Classical Philology* 45(1): 1–12.
- Gibbons, Luke. 1996. *Transformations in Irish Culture*. Cork: Cork University Press.
- Gibson, Andrew. 2002. *Joyce's Revenge: History, Politics, and Aesthetics in Ulysses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gifford, Don. 1989. *Ulysses Annotated: Notes for James Joyce's Ulysses*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gilbert, Stuart. 1955. *James Joyce's Ulysses: A Study*. New York: Random House.
- Giraldus Cambrensis. 1982. *Topographia Hibernae (The History and Topography of Ireland)*. Translated by John J. O'Meara. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press.
- Glenn, J. 1972. "The Fall of Mezentius." *Vergilius* 18: 10–15.
- Gordon, John. 1999. "'Circe,' *La Gioconda*, and the Opera House of the Mind." In *Bronze by Gold: The Music of Joyce*, edited by Sebastian Knowles. New York: Garland.
- Gotoff, H. C. 1984. "The Transformation of Mezentius." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 114: 191–218.
- Gregory, Lady Augusta. 1909. *The Kiltartan History Book*. Dublin: Maunsel & Co.
- Gregory, Lady Augusta. 1918. *The Kiltartan Poetry Book: Prose Translations from the Irish*. Dundrum: Cuala.
- Groden, Michael. 1975. "'Cyclops' in Progress." *James Joyce Quarterly* 12(2): 123–168.
- Gross, Murray J. 2002. "Joyce's Influence on Euripides?" *James Joyce Quarterly* 39(2): 336–337.
- Gruen, Erich S. 1992. *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Habinek, Thomas N. 1989. "Science and Tradition in *Aeneid* 6." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 92: 223–255.
- Habinek, Thomas N. 1998. *The Politics of Latin Literature: Writing, Identity, and Empire in Ancient Rome*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Halperin, David. 1983. *Before Pastoral: Theocritus and the Ancient Tradition of Bucolic Poetry*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Hardie, Philip R. 1986. *Virgil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Hardwick, Lorna. 2003. *Reception Studies. Greece & Rome: New Surveys in the Classics No. 33*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hardwick, Lorna. 2007. "Postcolonial Studies." In *A Companion to the Classical Tradition*, edited by Craig Kallendorf, 312–327. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Bibliography

- Hardwick, Lorna, and Christopher Stray. 2011. *A Companion to Classical Receptions*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Harkness, Marguerite. 1975. "Circe': The Mousetrap of *Ulysses*." *James Joyce Quarterly* 12: 259–272.
- Harrison, E. L. 1977. "Structure and Meaning in Vergil's *Aeneid*." *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 2: 101–112.
- Harrison, Stephen J. 1990. "Some Views on the *Aeneid* in the Twentieth Century." In *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid*, edited by S. J. Harrison, 1–20. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harrison, Stephen J. 1991. *Vergil, Aeneid 10*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hayman, David. 1974. "Cyclops." In *James Joyce's Ulysses: Critical Essays*, edited by Clive Hart and David Hayman, 243–275. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Heinze, Richard. 1993. *Virgil's Epic Technique*. Translated by Hazel Harvey, David Harvey, and Fred Robertson. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Herr, Cheryl. 1986. *Joyce's Anatomy of Culture*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Hinds, Stephen. 1998. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hirsch, Edward. 1991. "The Imaginary Irish Peasant." *Publications of the Modern Language Association* 106: 1116–1133.
- Hobsbawm, Eric. 1990. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hobsbawm, Eric, and Terence Ranger, eds. 1992. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Horsfall, Nicholas M. 1971. "Numanus Remulus: Ethnography and Propaganda in *Aeneid* 9.598ff." *Latomus* 30: 1108–1116.
- Horsfall, Nicholas M. 1973. "Dido in the Light of History." *Proceedings of the Vergil Society* 13: 1–13.
- Iser, Wolfgang. 1978. *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Iser, Wolfgang. 1989. *Prospecting: From Reader Response to Literary Anthropology*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Jameson, Fredric. 1981. *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Jameson, Fredric. 1988. "Cognitive Mapping." In *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, edited by Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg, 347–360. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Jameson, Fredric. 1990. "Modernism and Imperialism." In *Nationalism, Colonialism, and Literature*, edited by Seamus Deane, 43–66. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Jameson, Fredric. 1991. *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Jauss, Hans Robert. 1970. *Literaturgeschichte als Provokation*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.

Bibliography

- Jauss, Hans Robert. 1982. *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*. Translated by Timothy Bahti. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Johnson, Steven. 2006. *The Ghost Map*. New York: Penguin.
- Johnson, W. Ralph. 1976. *Darkness Visible: A Study of Vergil's Aeneid*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Johnson, W. Ralph. 1986. "The Figure of Laertes: Reflections on the Character of Aeneas." In *Vergil at 2000: Commemorative Essays on the Poet and His Influence*, edited by John D. Bernard, 85–105. New York: AMS Press.
- Jones, Frederick. 2011. *Virgil's Garden: The Nature of Bucolic Space*. London: Bristol Classical Press.
- Joyce, James. 1986. *Ulysses*. Edited by Hans Walter Gabler, Wolfhard Steppe, and Claus Melchior. New York: Random House.
- Kallendorf, Craig, ed. 2007. *A Companion to the Classical Tradition*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kennedy, Duncan. 1997a. "Modern Receptions and Their Interpretative Implications." In *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*, edited by Charles Martindale, 38–55. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kennedy, Duncan. 1997b. "Virgilian Epic." In *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*, edited by Charles Martindale, 145–154. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kenner, Hugh. 1955. *Dublin's Joyce*. London: Chatto and Windus.
- Kenner, Hugh. 1974. "Circe." In *James Joyce's Ulysses: Critical Essays*, edited by David Hayman, 341–362. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kenner, Hugh. 1987. *Ulysses*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Kiberd, Declan. 1995. *Inventing Ireland: The Literature of the Modern Nation*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- King, K. Callen. 1982. "Foil and Fusion: Homer's Achilles in Vergil's Aeneid." *Materiali e Discussioni* 9: 31–57.
- Kinsey, Thomas E. 1979. "Aeneid VI 88–90." *Maia* 31: 267.
- Kristeva, Julia. 1985. "Intertextuality and Literary Interpretation." Interview by Margaret Walker (1985). In *Julia Kristeva Interviews*, edited by Ross M. Guberman, 188–203. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kurz, André. 1982. *Le Corpus Theocriteum et Homère: Un problème d'authenticité*. Berne: Publications Universitaires Européennes.
- LaCapra, Dominic. 1987. "Criticism Today." In *The Aims of Representation: Subject/Text/History*, edited by Murray Krieger, 235–255. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Leach, Eleanor Winsor. 1971. "The Blindness of Mezentius (*Aeneid* 10.762–768)." *Arethusa* 4(1): 83–89.
- Leach, Eleanor Winsor. 1974. *Vergil's Eclogues: Landscapes of Experience*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Lee, M. Owen. 1979. *Fathers and Sons in Virgil's Aeneid*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1987. *Introduction to the Work of Marcel Mauss*. Translated by Felicity Baker. London: Routledge.

Bibliography

- Levin, Harry. 1960. *James Joyce: A Critical Introduction*. New York: New Directions.
- Lloyd, David. 1993. *Anomalous States: Irish Writing and the Post-colonial Moment*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Lyne, R. O. A. M. 1987. *Further Voices in Vergil's Aeneid*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Lyne, R. O. A. M. 1989. *Words and the Poet: Characteristic Techniques of Style in Vergil's Aeneid*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Lyons, F. S. L. 1971. *Ireland since the Famine*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Lyons, F. S. L. 1979. *Culture and Anarchy in Ireland, 1890–1939*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- MacCabe, Colin. 1979. *James Joyce and the Revolution of the Word*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- MacCabe, Colin. 1982. *James Joyce: New Perspectives*. Brighton: Harvester.
- Mack, Sarah. 1978. *Patterns of Time in Vergil*. Hamden: Archon.
- Mackie, C. J. 1991. "Turnus and His Ancestors." *Classical Quarterly* 41: 261–265.
- Manetti, Giovanni. 1993. *Theories of the Sign in Classical Antiquity*. Translated by Christine Richardson. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Manganiello, Dominic. 1980. *James Joyce's Politics*. London: Routledge.
- Marincola, John. 2010. "Eros and Empire: Virgil and the Historians on Civil War." In *Ancient Historiography and Its Contexts: Studies in Honour of A. J. Woodman*, edited by Christina S. Kraus, John Marincola, and Christopher Pelling, 183–204. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Martindale, Charles. 1993a. "Descent into Hell: Reading Ambiguity, or Virgil and the Critics." *Proceedings of the Vergil Society* 21: 111–150.
- Martindale, Charles. 1993b. *Redeeming the Text*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Martindale, Charles. 1997. "Introduction: 'The Classic of All Europe.'" In *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*, edited by Charles Martindale, 1–18. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Martindale, Charles. 2006. "Thinking Through Reception." In *Classics and the Uses of Reception*, edited by Charles Martindale and Richard F. Thomas, 1–13. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Martindale, Charles. 2007. "Reception." In *A Companion to the Classical Tradition*, edited by Craig Kallendorf, 297–311. Oxford: Blackwell.
- McDonald, Michael. 1995. "'Circe' and the Uncanny, or Joyce from Freud to Marx." *James Joyce Quarterly* 33(1): 49–68.
- Miola, Robert S. 1988. "Aeneas and Hamlet." *Classical and Modern Literature* 8(4): 275–290.
- Moore, Clifford Herschel. 1921. "Prophecy in the Ancient Epic." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 32: 99–175.
- Most, Glenn W. 2001. "Memory and Forgetting in the *Aeneid*." *Vergilius* 47: 148–170.
- Mouritsen, Henrik. 1998. *Italian Unification: A Study in Ancient and Modern Historiography*. London: Institute of Classical Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London.
- Mueller, Alex. 2006. "'The Soft Beauty of the Latin Word': Experiencing Latin in James Joyce's *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*." *Classical and Modern Literature* 26(2): 179–196.

Bibliography

- Münzer, Friedrich. 1911. *Cacus der Rinderdieb*. Basel: Universitätsbuchdruckerei.
- Mynors, R. A. B., ed. 1969. *Vergili Opera*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nadel, Ira B. 1990. "'Circe': Textual Method and Textual Meaning." *Studies in the Novel* 22(2): 163–178.
- Newman, John Kevin. 1967. *The Concept of Vates in Augustan Poetry*. Brussels: Latomus.
- Nicolet, Claude. 1991. *Space, Geography, and Politics in the Early Roman Empire*. Translated by Hélène Leclerc. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Nolan, Emer. 1995. *James Joyce and Nationalism*. London: Routledge.
- Nolan, Emer. 2000. "State of the Art: Joyce and Postcolonialism." In *Semicolonial Joyce*, edited by Derek Attridge and Marjorie Howes, 78–95. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Brien, Joseph V. 1982. *Dear, Dirty Dublin: A City in Distress, 1899–1916*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- O'Grady, Standish. 1881. *History of Ireland: Critical and Philosophical*. London: Sampson Low & Co.
- O'Hara, James. 1990. *Death and the Optimistic Prophecy in Vergil's Aeneid*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- O'Hara, James. 1997. "Virgil's Style." In *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*, edited by Charles Martindale, 241–258. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Hara, James. 2006. *Inconsistency in Roman Epic: Studies in Catullus, Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid, and Lucan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oliensis, Ellen. 2009. *Freud's Rome: Psychoanalysis and Latin Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ossa-Richardson, Anthony. 2008. "From Servius to Frazer: The Golden Bough and Its Transformations." *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 15: 339–368.
- Osteen, Mark. 1998. "Meredith/Joyce: Bella Mount and Bella's Mount." *James Joyce Quarterly* 35(4): 873–878.
- Otis, Brooks. 1964. *Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Parry, Adam. 1963. "The Two Voices of Virgil's *Aeneid*." *Arion* 2: 66–80.
- Paschalis, Michael. 1986. "The Unifying Theme of Daedalus' Sculptures on the Temple of Apollo Cumanus (*Aeneid* 6.20–33)." *Vergilius* 32: 33–41.
- Patterson, Annabel. 1987. *Pastoral and Ideology: Virgil to Valéry*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Peradotto, John. 1990. *Man in the Middle Voice: Name and Narration in the Odyssey*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Perkell, Christine. 1994. "Ambiguity and Irony: The Last Resort?" *Helios* 21: 63–74.
- Perutelli, Alessandro. 1978. "L'inversione speculare: Per una retorica dell'ecphrasis." *Materiali e Discussioni* 1: 87–98.
- Platt, Len. 1998. "Pisgah Sights: The National Press and the Catholic Middle Class in 'Aeolus.'" *James Joyce Quarterly* 35(4): 735–746.
- Porter, James I. 2003. "The Materiality of Classical Studies." *Parallax* 9: 64–74.
- Porter, James I. 2011. "Reception Studies: Future Prospects." In *A Companion to Classical*

Bibliography

- Receptions*, edited by Lorna Hardwick and Christopher Stray, 469–481. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Pöschl, Viktor. 1962. *The Art of Vergil: Image and Symbol in the Aeneid*. Translated by Gerda Seligson. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Pöschl, Viktor. 1975. "Die Tempeltüren des Dädalus in der Aeneid." *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft* 1: 119–133.
- Potter, David Stone. 1994. *Prophets and Emperors*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Pound, Ezra. 1967. "James Joyce: At Last the Novel Appears." In *Pound/Joyce: The Letters of Ezra Pound to James Joyce with Pound's Essays on Joyce*, vol. 1, edited by Forrest Read, 91. London: Faber & Faber.
- Pound, Ezra. 1970. "Dubliners and Mr. James Joyce." In *James Joyce: The Critical Heritage*, vol. 1, edited by Robert H. Deming, 66–68. London: Routledge.
- Powell, Anton. 2008. *Virgil the Partisan*. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales.
- Putnam, Michael C. J. 1965. *The Poetry of the Aeneid*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Putnam, Michael C. J. 1970. *Virgil's Pastoral Art: Studies in the Eclogues*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Putnam, Michael C. J. 1981. "Pius Aeneas and the Metamorphosis of Lausus." *Arethusa* 14(1): 139–156.
- Putnam, Michael C. J. 1987. "Daedalus, Virgil, and the End of Art." *American Journal of Philology* 108: 173–198.
- Putnam, Michael C. J. 1998. *Virgil's Epic Designs*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Quint, David. 1993. *Epic and Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Raaflaub, Kurt, and L. J. Samons. 1990. "Opposition to Augustus." In *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and His Principate*, edited by Kurt Raaflaub and Mark Toher, 417–454. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Radford, Fred. 1994. "'Cloacal Obsession': Hugo, Joyce and the Sewer Museum of Paris." *Mattoid* 48: 66–85.
- Rankin, H. D. 1973. "Joyce's Satyr-Play: The 'Cyclops' Episode in *Ulysses*." *Agora* 2(2): 3–12.
- Rasmussen, Eric. 1984. "Fathers and Sons in *Hamlet*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 35(4): 463.
- Reed, J. D. 2007. *Virgil's Gaze: Nation and Poetry in the Aeneid*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Reed, Nicholas. 1973. "The Gates of Sleep in *Aeneid* 6." *Classical Quarterly* 23(2): 311–315.
- Reid, Donald. 1991. *Paris Sewers and Sewermen: Realities and Representations*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Rutledge, Harry C. 1971. "The Opening of *Aeneid* 6." *Classical Journal* 67: 110–115.
- Said, Edward. 1990. "Yeats and Decolonization." In *Nationalism, Colonialism, and Literature*, edited by Seamus Deane, 69–95. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Saunders, Timothy. 2008. *Bucolic Ecology: Virgil's Eclogues and the Environmental Literary Tradition*. London: Duckworth.
- Schmidt, Ernst A. 1998. "Freedom and Ownership: A Contribution to the Discussion of Virgil's First Eclogue." *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar* 10: 185–201.

Bibliography

- Schork, Richard J. 1997. *Latin and Roman Culture in Joyce*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
- Schutte, William M. 1957. *Joyce and Shakespeare: A Study in the Meaning of Ulysses*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Segal, Charles. 1965. "Aeternum per saecula nomen, The Golden Bough and the Tragedy of History: Part I." *Arion* 4: 617–657.
- Senn, Fritz. 1989a. "Bucolic Strands in 'Aeolus.'" *James Joyce Quarterly* 27(1): 129–132.
- Senn, Fritz. 1989b. "Ovidian Roots of Gigantism in Joyce's *Ulysses*." *Journal of Modern Literature* 15(4): 561–577.
- Small, Jocelyn Penny. 1982. *Cacus and Marsyas in Etrusco-Roman Legend*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Smith, Eric D. 2002. "'I Have Been a Perfect Pig': A Semiosis of Swine in 'Circe.'" *Joyce Studies Annual* 13: 129–146.
- Smith, Larry. 1986. "A Mirror of the Whole: Shaun in Book III, Chapters 1–3." *Modern Fiction Studies* 32(4): 561–568.
- Solmsen, Friedrich. 1972. "The World of the Dead in Book 6 of the *Aeneid*." *Classical Philology* 67(1): 31–41.
- Solodow, Joseph. 1988. *The World of Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Stahl, Hans-Peter. 1990. "The Death of Turnus: Augustan Vergil and the Political Rival." In *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and His Principate*, edited by Kurt Raaffaub and Mark Toher, 174–211. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Stanford, William Bedell. 1963. *The Ulysses Theme: A Study in the Adaptability of a Traditional Hero*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Stanford, William Bedell. 1976. *Ireland and the Classical Tradition*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Stanley, K. 1965. "Irony and Foreshadowing in *Aeneid* 1.462." *American Journal of Philology* 86: 276–277.
- Stephens, Susan A., and Phiroze Vasunia. 2010. *Classics and National Cultures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sullivan, F. A. 1969. "Mezentius: A Vergilian Creation." *Classical Philology* 64(4): 219–225.
- Syed, Yasmin. 2005. *Vergil's Aeneid and the Roman Self*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Syme, Ronald. 1939. *The Roman Revolution*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Tanner, Marie. 1993. *The Last Descendant of Aeneas: The Hapsburgs and the Mythic Image of the Emperor*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Tarrant, Richard J. 1982. "Aeneas and the Gates of Sleep." *Classical Philology* 77: 51–55.
- Thomas, Richard F. 2000. "A Trope by Any Other Name: 'Polysemy,' Ambiguity, and Significatio in Virgil." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 100: 381–407.
- Thomas, Richard F. 2001. *Virgil and the Augustan Reception*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bibliography

- Thompkins, Jayne P., ed. 1980. *Reader Response Criticism: From Formalism to Post-Structuralism*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Toll, Katharine. 1991. "The *Aeneid* as an Epic of National Identity: *Italiam laeto socii clamore salutant*." *Helios* 18: 3–14.
- Toll, Katharine. 1997. "Making Roman-ness in the *Aeneid*." *Classical Antiquity* 16: 34–56.
- Tracy, Stephen V. 1975. "The Marcellus Passage (*Aeneid* 6.860–886) and *Aeneid* 9–12." *Classical Journal* 70(4): 37–42.
- Ungar, Andras. 2002. *Joyce's Ulysses as National Epic*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
- Valente, Joseph. 1995. *James Joyce and the Problem of Justice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Nortwick, Tom. 1980. "Aeneas, Turnus, and Achilles." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 110: 303–314.
- Vasunia, Phiroze. 2005. "Greater Rome and Greater Britain." In *Classics and Colonialism*, edited by Barbara Goff, 38–64. London: Duckworth.
- Vasunia, Phiroze. 2009. "Virgil and the British Empire, 1760–1880." In *Lineages of Empire: The Historical Roots of British Imperial Thought*, edited by Duncan Kelly, 83–116. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Volk, Katharina. 2008. *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Vergil's Eclogues*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Weber, Clifford. 1978. "Gallus' Grynium and Virgil's Cumae." *Mediterraneus* 1: 45–76.
- Wellesley, Kenneth. 1968. "Virgil's Araxes." *Classical Philology* 63: 139–141.
- West, David. 1987. *The Bough and the Gate, 17th Jackson Knight Memorial Lecture*. Exeter: Exeter University Publications.
- White, Peter. 1993. *Promised Verse: Poets in the Society of Augustan Rome*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Williams, Gordon. 1983. *Technique and Ideas in the Aeneid*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Williams, R. Deryck. 1964. "The Sixth Book of the *Aeneid*." *Greece and Rome* 11: 48–63.
- Williams, R. Deryck, ed. 1972. *The Aeneid of Virgil*. London: Macmillan; St. Martin's Press.
- Williams, R. Deryck. 1987. *The Aeneid*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Williams, R. Deryck. 1990. "The Purpose of the *Aeneid*." In *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid*, edited by S. J. Harrison, 21–36. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Winterbottom, Michael. 1976. "Virgil and the Confiscations." *Greece and Rome* 23: 55–59.
- Yaeger, Patricia. 2007. "Editor's Column: The Polyphony Issue." *Publications of the Modern Language Association* 122(2): 433–448.
- Yeats, William Butler, ed. 1986. *Fairy and Folk Tales of Ireland*. New York: Macmillan.
- Ziolkowski, Theodore. 1993. *Virgil and the Moderns*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Index

- Achilles, 127, 129, 148n17
- Actium, 7, 20, 51, 62, 69, 71–73, 82, 89, 148n20
- Aeneas: arrival in Italy, 11, 95; and Augustus, 45–46, 51, 71, 77, 96, 101–102, 111, 135–136, 152n26; as conqueror, 20, 76–83, 89, 148n24; exit from the underworld, 93–95, 104–105, 132, 151–152nn23–24; as father, 84–85, 96, 99–102, 141; and Hercules, 45–46; as Italian, 70, 75–83, 147n12; and Lausus, 83–89, 149n27; as monarch, 50–51, 146n6, 150n13; and mourning, 71, 84–88; as narrator, 61, 153n12; in Pallanteum, 19, 44, 55, 58, 76–77; as reader/audience, 22, 58, 115–127, 129–134, 155n35; shield of, 20, 51, 62, 69, 72; as son, 22, 84–85, 91, 96, 99–102, 131–134, 151n15, 151n23, 155n44; in Troy, 30; and Turnus, 19, 44, 46, 81–83, 86, 89, 127, 132, 146n6, 150n12, 155n24; in the underworld, 11, 21–22, 91–105, 129–136, 150n3, 150nn8–10, 155nn42–43
- Aeneid* (Virgil): nationalism in, 5, 7, 11, 17–20, 68–90, 111, 121, 129, 140–142; temporality of, 10–11, 111, 129, 131, 134; writing and publication of, 3, 140
- Africa, 37–38, 62. *See also* Carthage
- Agamben, Giorgio, 143n5
- Agrippa, Marcus Vipsanianus, 102
- Allecto, 70–71
- Amata, 73–75, 78
- ambiguity, 39, 56, 125–127, 131, 144n18, 149n28, 155n38
- Anchises: invoked by supplicants, 84–85, 155n44; in the underworld, 87–88, 91, 94–95, 99–105, 129–135, 151n23, 152n26
- Anderson, Benedict: Bhabha's revision of, 10, 121, 129, 134, 155n44; definition of nationalism, 4–10; on ideology, 89; influence of, 4, 121; on the invention of tradition, 66, 80; on mourning, 80, 83; on the reassurance of fratricide, 80–83, 148n20, 149n32; and the study of antiquity, 5–10, 19–20, 138, 140
- Antony (Marcus Antonius), 7, 20, 46, 69, 72, 82, 89, 102, 145n6
- Apollo, 22, 98, 115, 120, 124–125, 129
- Arcadia, 20, 44–46, 55–59, 73, 78
- Ars Amatoria* (Ovid), 98
- Ascanius, 50, 84–85, 87, 148n24
- Attridge, Derek, 13, 36, 140
- Auerbach, Erich, 137–138
- Augustus: descendant of Aeneas, 45–46, 51, 71, 77, 96, 101–102, 111, 135–136, 152n26; and civil war, 20, 46, 69, 71–72, 91, 105; golden age of, 46–47, 106, 152n26; judgments of, 4, 45, 70–71, 112, 147n15, 152n4; and Italian unity, 7, 20, 38, 69–70, 72, 77, 89; monarchy of, 21, 51, 67, 143n5; in the parade of heroes, 131; *Res Gestae*, 6; succession plans of, 21, 87, 91, 101–102. *See also* Octavian
- Bakhtin, Mikhail, 137–138, 143n9
- Benjamin, Walter, 8–11, 121, 140, 143n10
- Bhabha, Homi, 10, 68–69, 113–114, 121, 129, 134–135, 140, 148n21, 155n45
- Bloom, Leopold: parallel with Aeneas, 94–97, 100–101, 105, 141; conflict with the citizen, 13, 43–44, 49, 63; as father, 21–22, 91, 95–96, 100–111, 119, 135–136; gramophone of, 127–128; internationalism of, 12–13; Jewishness of, 21, 43–44, 66, 78–79, 90, 104; as Odysseus, 92, 150n13; as sovereign, 21, 92, 96, 105–111, 135–136, 141–142, 146n12, 150n10, 152n25

- Bloom, Molly, 95, 107
 Bloom, Rudy: death of, 91, 95–96, 102–104, 109, 119, 135–136; Jewishness of, 101, 104; parallel with Hermes, 151n22; parallel with Marcellus, 21, 91–92, 101–111, 135–136, 141, 152n24
 Boylan, “Blazes,” 95, 100

 Cacus, 14, 18–19, 41–42, 44–68, 91, 108, 141, 156n6
 Caesar, Julius, 10, 51, 101–102, 131, 133–134
 Carr, Private, 95, 103, 107
 Carthage, 75–76, 147n9, 150nn12–13
 Catholicism, 25–27, 29–30, 33, 35, 90
 Cato the Elder, 81, 83, 148n18
 cattle, 31, 45–49, 57–58, 75
 Chakrabarty, Dipesh, 8–11, 140
 Cheng, Vincent, 13, 66
 citizen, the (character in *Ulysses*): conflict with Bloom, 12–13, 43–44, 49, 63, 66, 79; nationalism of, 12–13, 18–19, 41–44, 49–52, 60–69, 79, 82–83, 90–91, 107–109, 141–142; parallel with Cacus, 14, 18–19, 41–42, 47–55, 60–69, 91, 141
 civil war, American, 147n14
 civil war, Irish, 90, 102, 107–110
 civil war, Roman: aftermath of, 3, 19–21, 39, 105; Augustus’s involvement in, 69–71, 82, 91, 102; geography of, 39, 70, 79–80; Latin War as, 69–71, 80–87, 90, 141, 147n4; Virgilian representations of, 20–21, 39, 105, 132–135, 141
 Cleopatra, 7, 51, 65, 89
 Cohen, Bella, 92, 98, 103, 108, 150n13
 Cohen, Jeffrey, 42
 colonialism: in the *Aeneid*, 70, 90, 140–141; association with modernism, 112–114, 121; education and, 26; literary form of, 10; and national culture, 66, 80, 145n10; temporality of, 8; in *Ulysses*, 12–13, 18, 21–22, 33–43, 49, 108–114, 140–141
 colonization, 5, 52, 80, 114
 Conte, Gian Biagio, 86, 111–112, 116, 135
 Crawford, Myles, 24
 Creusa, 132
 Cusack, Michael, 41–43, 50, 67
Cyclops (Euripides), 14, 53
 Daedalus: as artist, 98, 114–119, 129–130, 135, 153n12, 153n14, 153n20, 154n24, 155n39; flight of, 22, 97–98, 115
 David, Jean-Michel, 7, 39
 Davitt, Michael, 32, 34
 decolonization, 107, 109–110, 152n30
 Dedalus, Simon, 96, 98, 119
 Dedalus, Stephen: departure from Ireland of, 11–12, 144n12; linguistic ability of, 26–27; name of, 26, 97–98, 119; nationalism of, 90, 107, 145n9; Shakespearian reading of, 98–100; as son, 95–100, 103–107, 110, 135; as storyteller/artist, 18, 24, 27, 30–35, 119, 144n12, 145n9
 Derrida, Jacques, 121–123, 128, 154n23, 154nn29–32, 155n37
 Dido, 47, 50–51, 61, 78, 96–98, 132, 146n6, 150nn12–13
 Dignam, Paddy, 100–101
 Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 57, 148n24
 Duffy, Enda, 12, 66, 111, 113

 Easter Rising, the, 25, 150n10
Eclogues (Virgil): Galatea in, 54; global geography in, 37–39, 145n11; as messianic prophecy, 105; and the parable of the plums, 18, 24–25, 31–41, 140, 145n9; politics of land in, 18, 31–41, 68, 145n15
 Edmunds, Lowell, 14
 ekphrasis: of the doors of the temple of Apollo, 114–119, 130, 135, 153n17, 155n39; of the facecloth in “Cyclops,” 79; as interruption of narrative, 115–116, 118–119, 130, 135, 152n8, 153n16; as parallel of the larger text, 153n12, 153n22
 Ellmann, Richard, 12, 92, 96, 105, 146n8
 Empire, Austro-Hungarian, 105
 Empire, British: global reach of, 112; Nelson as representative of, 33; parallel with Roman Empire, 3, 19, 25–27, 35, 90, 109, 152n29; resistance to, 19, 25–28, 35, 49, 58, 107; suppression of Irish history, 64
 Empire, Roman: contact with Ireland, 27, 35–36, 42, 64–65; global reach of, 6; parallel with British Empire, 3, 19, 25–27, 35, 90, 109, 152n29; as political entity, 3, 89, 91–92; as territorial domination, 6–7, 29–30, 141–142

- Ennius, 81, 130, 148n18
 Etruscans, 56–57, 73, 77, 83, 88
 Euripides, 14, 53
 Evander, 19, 44, 45–46, 48, 51, 55, 57–60, 73, 76–78

 fatherhood: of Aeneas, 84–85, 96, 99–102, 141;
 of Anchises, 131–132, 151n15; of Bloom, 21–
 22, 91, 95–96, 100–111, 119, 135–136; of
 Daedalus, 117, 153n14; in *Hamlet*, 151n14;
 of Mezentius, 84–88, 149n28; of Odysseus,
 143n7; in the parade of heroes, 131–135
 Faunus, 56, 73, 76
Finnegans Wake (Joyce), 36, 94–95
 Fish, Stanley, 15
 Fletcher, K. F. B., 5
 form, literary: and content, 43–44, 108–109,
 130–131, 135; discontinuous, 43–44, 108–
 109, 112–119, 130–131, 134–135, 139, 152n8;
 politics of, 8–11, 17, 108–109, 130–131,
 134–135
 Fowler, Don, 116, 122, 126, 135
 fratricide: metaphor for civil war, 20, 82, 89; re-
 assurance of, 80, 83, 88–90, 141–142, 147n14,
 148n20, 148n22; as revision of conquest, 71;
 of Romulus, 82, 148n20
furor, 47, 52

 Gadamer, Hans-Georg, 15
 Gaelic Athletic Association, 41–42, 64
 Gaelic Revival. *See* Revival, Irish
 Galatea, 33, 53–55, 146n9
 Galinsky, G. Karl, 45, 126–127, 144n18, 146n3
 Garryowen, 49–50, 52, 107
 Gellius, Gnaeus, 56–57
 genre. *See* form, literary
 geography: and identity, 37, 39, 141; of Ireland,
 78–80; of Italy, 7, 39, 71, 75, 90, 141; of the
 Roman Empire, 20, 37, 71, 113–114, 145n11;
 in similes, 75, 147nn9–10
Georgics (Virgil), 56, 144n1, 145n2, 147n6
 Germany, 37
 Geryon, 46, 49–50, 52
 Gibson, Andrew, 66, 108
 gigantism, 60–65
 Gigantomachy, 61–65
 Gilbert, Stuart, 12, 42

 Giraldus Cambrensis, 42, 64
 Great War, the. *See* World War I
 Gregory, Lady, 64
 Gross, Murray, 53

 Haines, 26–27
Hamlet (Shakespeare), 98–101, 106, 151nn14–15
 Hardie, Philip, 45, 61–63, 81
 Harkness, Marguerite, 100, 106
 Hector, 127
 Helenus, 120–129, 155n35
 Hercules, 18–19, 41–42, 44–53, 56–62, 64, 67–68,
 77, 141
 Hinds, Stephen, 14–16, 138–139
 Hirsch, Edward, 55
 historicism, 8–10, 16, 113
 Hobsbawm, Eric, 19
 Homer: as epic exemplar, 10, 137–138, 143n7;
 mediated through Ovid, 53–54; mediated
 through Virgil, 30, 53–54, 60, 93–94;
 Polyphemus in, 14, 41–42, 47, 53–54, 60,
 67, 146n13; prophecy in, 56; structure of
 Ulysses, 3, 11–12, 25, 92–94, 96–97, 150n3;
 Virgilian use of, 14, 45, 53–54, 58, 60, 111
 Howes, Marjorie, 13, 36, 140
 Hugo, Victor, 28
 Hungary, 21, 43, 66, 78, 105

 Icarus, 22, 98, 115, 117–118
indigenismo, 80
 Iopas, 47–48, 61, 64
 Irish language, 26–27, 35, 41, 66, 79
 Irish Revival. *See* Revival, Irish
 Iser, Wolfgang, 15
 Italy, unity of: as an Augustan development, 7–8,
 19–21, 38–39, 89–90, 111; and civil war, 19–
 21, 68–83, 85–90; projection onto the past
 of, 68–83, 85–90, 136, 141, 147nn6–13; and
 the Social War, 78, 20, 38–39
 Iulus, 50, 84–85, 87, 148n24

 James, C. L. R., 114
 Jameson, Fredric, 112–113, 135, 140, 152n5
 Jauss, Hans Robert, 15–16
 Julia (daughter of Augustus), 101–102
 Juno, 50–51, 70–71, 73, 75, 77, 147n6, 155n35
 Jupiter, 6, 11, 20, 47, 50–51, 73, 82, 99

- Kearns, Anne, 24, 32–35
 Kelleher, Corny, 96, 103, 152n24
 Kenner, Hugh, 12
 Kristeva, Julia, 14
- land, politics of, 18, 31–35, 37–38, 41
 Land League, the, 32, 34–35
 language: English, 26–27, 35, 41, 66, 89; Greek, 25–31, 35–36; Irish (Gaelic), 26–27, 35, 41, 66, 79; Latin, 25–31, 35, 77, 136, 144n12, 145n4, 146n12, 149n2
 Latinus, 73–76, 81
 Latium, 20, 73–75, 81, 95, 127, 148n24
 Lausus, 71, 73, 83–89, 148n22, 148n24, 149n27
 Lavinia, 76, 81, 97
Les Misérables (Hugo), 28–29
 Levin, Harry, 12
 Livy, 53, 57–59, 67, 81, 92, 146n12
 Lloyd, David, 18–19, 43–44, 66, 78
 Lyne, R. O. A. M., 126
 Lyons, F. S. L., 42
- MacCabe, Colin, 12
 MacCabe, Florence, 24, 32–35
 MacHugh (character in *Ulysses*), 18, 24, 27–35, 152n29
 Manganiello, Dominic, 12
 Marcellus: and the Augustan succession, 21–22, 87–88, 91–92, 101–109, 130–131, 134–135, 143n5; parallel with Lausus, 87–89, 148n22; parallel with Rudy, 21–22, 91–92, 101–109, 111–112, 141; as perfect Roman, 87–88, 103, 114–115, 149nn29–31
 Martindale, Charles, 15–16, 116, 126–127, 148n15, 155n37
 McGreevy, Thomas, 98–99, 101
Metamorphoses (Ovid), 53–54, 97, 138–139, 144n19, 146n7
 metempsychosis, 100–101, 151n16
 Meliboeus, 31–32, 35, 37–39, 145n11
 Mezentius, 73, 77, 83–86, 88, 148–149nn22–25
 Michelet, Jules, 80, 149n32
 milkwoman, 27
Mimesis (Auerbach), 137–138
 modernism, 12–13, 17, 26, 36, 40, 112–114, 135–136, 139–140
- monarchy, 44, 49, 51, 67, 105, 108, 141, 150n13
 monstrosity, 14, 18–19, 41–42, 44–47, 49–57, 59–60, 65
 Mouritsen, Henrik, 39
 mourning, 68, 71, 83–89, 119, 128, 143n5, 148n21, 149n30
 Mulligan, Buck, 26–27, 29, 98–99
- Napoleon, 24
 narratology, 112, 116, 118
 nationalism: in antiquity, 4–8, 68–70, 80, 89–90, 140–142; modernity of, 4–8, 13, 17, 19–20, 44, 68, 138, 140, 143n4. *See also* Anderson, Benedict; Bhabha, Homi
 Nelson, Horatio, 24, 32–35
 Nolan, Emer, 13, 18–19, 39, 43–44, 66, 78, 107, 108–109, 111
 Nolan, John Wyse, 78, 105
 Numanus Remulus, 74–75, 77–78, 147n8
- Octavian, 7, 20, 39–40, 72, 82, 102. *See also* Augustus
Odyssey (Homer): as epic exemplar, 10, 137–138, 143n7; mediated through Ovid, 53–54; mediated through Virgil, 30, 53–54, 60, 93–94; Polyphemus in, 14, 41–42, 47, 53–54, 60, 67, 146n13; prophecy in, 56; structure of *Ulysses*, 3, 11–12, 25, 92–94, 96–97, 150n3; Virgilian use of, 14, 45, 53–54, 58, 60, 111
 O'Grady, Standish, 55, 64–65
 O'Molloy, J. J., 28, 30, 35
 orientalism, 7, 20, 71, 147n10
 Otis, Brooks, 20, 148n22, 155n43
 Ovid: Daedalus in, 97–98; Joyce's use of in "Circe," 25, 92, 144n19, 146n7; Joyce's use of in "Cyclops," 25, 53–55, 60, 97–98, 144n19, 146n7; Joyce's use of in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, 144n12, 146n7; Polyphemus in, 14, 53–55, 67; prophecy in, 56; reception of the *Aeneid* of, 138–139
- Palinurus, 96
 Pallanteum, 19
 Pallas, 84–88, 127, 148n22
 Parable of the Plums, the, 18, 24–25, 31–36

- Parnell, Charles Stewart, 25, 32, 34–35
 Parry, Adam, 112, 148n15
 Parthia, 37
 Pasiphae, 97–98, 117–119, 153n19
 pastoral, 41, 46–47, 52–55, 57–60. *See also* Arcadia
 Patroclus, 127
 Penates, 76
 Peradotto, John, 137–138
 Perkell, Christine, 126
 Perutelli, Alessandro, 116
 Phoenix Park Murders, 34
pietas, 85, 87–88, 102, 149nn27–28
 Plato, 122, 154n23, 154nn30–31, 155n37
Playboy of the Western World, The (Synge), 58
 Polyphemus, 14, 41, 43, 47, 53–55, 58, 60, 67, 146n13
 polysemy, 116, 125–127, 131, 144n18, 155n36, 155n38
 Pompey (Gnaeus Pompeius Magnus), 131, 133–134
 Porter, James, 15, 37
Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, A (Joyce), 11, 28, 119, 144n12
 postcolonialism: association with postmodernism, 113–114; in Ireland, 21, 39; literary form of, 113–114, 121, 152n28; and national culture, 41; in readings of the *Aeneid*, 3, 26, 36, 140–141; in readings of *Ulysses*, 3, 13, 26, 36, 52, 108–111, 113, 135, 140–141, 152n28
 postmodernism, 112–114, 121, 126, 136, 140
 Pound, Ezra, 12
 presentism, 16
 prophecy: of Cacus, 56; in Homer, 56; of Jupiter, 11, 47; obscurity of meaning in, 22, 119–129; in Ovid, 56; of the Sibyl, 22, 114–115, 119–130, 135, 154n25, 155n35; temporality of, 9–11, 134, 153n9, 154nn25–27, 155n35
 Putnam, Michael C. J., 45–46, 149n27, 153nn12–13, 153n20, 155n39, 155n44
 Pyrrhus, 29–30, 80–81, 148n17
 Quint, David, 111
 Rankin, H. D., 53
 Reed, J. D., 5, 147n10, 148n22, 149n31, 155n43
 Remus, 81–82, 148n20
Res Gestae (Augustus), 6
 Revival, Irish (Gaelic): Anglo-Irish proponents of, 80, 89; athletics in, 42–43; criticism of, 12, 19, 36, 42–43, 50–52, 60–61, 64–69, 88–89; language of, 26, 29, 89; myth and legend in, 41, 55, 60–64, 80–83, 91, 109; pastoral elements of, 55, 58, 60
Riders to the Sea (Synge), 58
 Romulus: as first king of Rome, 11, 56, 87, 103; and fratricide, 81–82, 148n20; as member of the Julian family, 101, 131
 Schork, R. J., 18–19, 47–50, 61, 92–93, 95, 97–98, 146n12
 Scythia, 37–38
 Senn, Fritz, 53–54, 145n9, 146n9
 sewers, 27–29, 145n5
 Shakespeare, William, 65, 92, 98–100
 Sibyl, the: prophecy of, 22, 114–115, 119–130, 135, 154n25, 155n35; as supporter of Bloom, 97, 106; in the temple of Apollo, 98, 118; in the underworld, 97, 104, 155n43
 Smith, Eric, 92
 Social War, the, 7, 20, 38–39, 145n13
 sovereignty, 6, 8, 21, 67, 74, 79, 90, 143n5
 succession: Augustan, 21, 91, 102, 135, 151n18; Astartian, 105; of Daedalus, 117, 119; in Ireland, 105, 107–111; literary, 139
 Syed, Yasmin, 5
 Syme, Ronald, 69
 Synge, John Millington, 58
 Taylor, John F., 30
 temporality, 8–11, 121, 129, 134
 Theocritus, 14, 53–54, 59–60, 67
 Theophrastus, 28, 145n6
 Thrace, 75, 147n9
 Thucydides, 10
 Tityrus, 31–33, 35, 37–39, 145n11
 Toll, Katherine, 5, 147n7, 147nn11–12
 Trafalgar, 24, 29, 33
 Trojans: as foreigners in Italy, 20; as invaders, 70, 73, 75–76, 80–83, 89; Italian ancestry of, 70, 76–77; Italianization of, 71, 73, 77, 82–83, 88, 147n10; as refugees, 55, 114; in *Ulysses*, 30
 Trojan War, 10, 61, 81, 96

Index

- Troy, 30, 55, 61, 73, 75, 77, 81
- Turnus: and Aeneas, 19, 44, 46, 81–83, 86, 89, 127, 132, 146n6, 150n12, 155n24; as for-eigner, 73–78; in geographical similes, 75, 147nn9–10; parallel with Lausus, 148n22; and Mezentius, 149n24
- Tweedy, Major, 90, 107–108
- tyranny, 44, 50–51, 67, 83–84, 88, 141–142
- Ulysses* (Joyce): “Aeolus,” 18, 24–35, 41, 101, 104, 112, 152n29; “Circe,” 21–23, 91–113, 119, 128–129, 135–136, 141, 149n1, 150n10, 150n13, 151n24; “Cyclops,” 12, 14, 18–19, 21–23, 41–43, 47–55, 61–69, 78, 82–83, 91, 105, 107–108, 112, 141, 146n2, 146n14–15; “Hades,” 92–96, 127–129, 150n3; Homeric parallels in, 3–4, 11–12, 14, 25–26, 30, 41–42, 53–54, 59–60, 67, 94; literary form of, 9, 17, 43, 55, 108–109, 112–113, 139, 152n28; “Scylla and Charybdis,” 98–101; “Telemachus,” 29, 98; writing and publication of, 3, 13, 25, 140
- Ungar, Andras, 19, 152n25
- Volk, Katharina, 39
- War of Independence, Irish, 3, 18, 25, 52, 70, 107–110, 140, 146n14
- Wells, H. G., 28
- World War I, 3, 105
- Wyndham Act, 32–33
- Yeats, William Butler, 25, 55, 58, 92
- Ziolkowski, Theodore, 36, 113

Index Locorum

Dionysius of Halicarnassus	7.554–559: 28
1.39: 57	7.555–556: 35
1.64–65: 148n24	7.560–570: 29, 35
Ennius	7.565–566: 33
<i>Annales</i>	7.790–883: 35
78 (Skutsch): 81	7.791–911: 30
Homer	7.909–911: 30
<i>Odyssey</i>	7.921–1075: 24
11.541–567: 97	7.931–932: 32
19.562–567: 93–94	7.941–947: 34
Hugo, Victor	7.948–951: 32
<i>Les Misérables</i>	7.952: 32
3.4.4: 29	7.1010: 34
Joyce, James	7.1023: 34
<i>Finnegans Wake</i>	7.1053: 24
147.22–24: 94	9.865–870: 99
151.9–11: 95	9.982–1025: 100
152.16: 36	12.114: 54
192.26–28: 94	12.118–120: 49
545.28–29: 95	12.148–150: 52
<i>Ulysses</i>	12.150: 49
1.79–80: 26	12.151–205: 48
1.433–434: 27	12.155–157: 48
1.555–557: 99	12.163–164: 48
1.561: 99	12.173–199: 48
1.643–644: 26	12.175–199: 82
6.459–461: 92	12.176: 52, 65
6.963–967: 128	12.176–178: 82
6.995: 93	12.182: 65
6.995–996: 94	12.183: 65
7.206–207: 101, 104	12.188: 65
7.484–495: 27	12.189: 65
7.491: 152n29	12.190–191: 65
7.493: 28	12.191: 65
7.499–500: 28, 35	12.442: 83

Joyce, James: *Ulysses* (*continued*)

12.499–500: 83
 12.519: 83
 12.829–830: 47
 12.880–881: 42
 12.897–901: 64
 12.1240–1251: 64
 12.1251: 42
 12.1419–1433: 79
 12.1438–1464: 79
 12.1467–1468: 79
 12.1574: 105
 12.1853–1857: 49
 12.1858–1865: 63
 12.1858–1896: 49
 12.1892: 49
 12.1893: 49
 15.99: 97
 15.120: 97
 15.656–675: 97
 15.708–712: 97
 15.1217: 100
 15.1226: 100
 15.1298: 108
 15.1353: 105
 15.1354–1956: 96
 15.1355: 106
 15.1363: 106
 15.1408: 106
 15.1438: 150n11
 15.1470–1482: 106
 15.1470–1956: 21
 15.1505–1506: 97
 15.1535–1536: 108
 15.1544–1545: 95, 106
 15.1565–1568: 146n12
 15.1616–1618: 107
 15.1723: 97
 15.1736–1737: 97
 15.1744: 106
 15.1752–1956: 150n10
 15.1834: 106
 15.1836: 106
 15.1933: 107
 15.1953–1954: 106

15.1958: 106
 15.2115: 128
 15.2170–2173: 128
 15.2175–2177: 129
 15.2211–2212: 129
 15.3763–3764: 100
 15.3821–3824: 100
 15.3865: 117
 15.3865–3867: 119
 15.3865–3869: 97
 15.3926: 97
 15.3935–3936: 98
 15.3946: 98
 15.4157: 100
 15.4277–4308: 103
 15.4306: 108
 15.4630: 107
 15.4745–4954: 103
 15.4747–4750: 95
 15.4804: 96
 15.4906–4931: 96
 15.4955–4967: 21, 103
 15.4958: 108
 15.4959: 101

Livy

1.7.4–14: 53
 1.7.5: 57
 1.7.6–15: 57

Ovid

Ars Amatoria

2.91: 98

Metamorphoses

8.155–157: 97
 13.623–14.582: 138
 13.826: 54

Shakespeare, William

Hamlet

I.v.22: 100

Solinus

1.7–10: 56

Virgil

Aeneid

1.1: 122, 124–125
 1.9: 50
 1.38: 50

Index Locorum

- | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1.46: 50 | 6.23–33: 117 |
| 1.52: 50 | 6.24: 118 |
| 1.62: 50 | 6.26: 118 |
| 1.65: 50 | 6.28–30: 118 |
| 1.76: 50 | 6.30–33: 117 |
| 1.137: 50 | 6.33–37: 118 |
| 1.241: 50 | 6.74–76: 22, 124 |
| 1.279: 6 | 6.77–82: 124–125 |
| 1.282: 147n11 | 6.89: 127 |
| 1.292–293: 82 | 6.103–105: 22, 123 |
| 1.294–296: 47 | 6.190–209: 94 |
| 1.303: 50 | 6.313–314: 93 |
| 1.389: 50 | 6.337–383: 96 |
| 1.454: 50 | 6.406–407: 97 |
| 1.496: 50 | 6.413–414: 132 |
| 1.522: 50 | 6.420: 97 |
| 1.544: 50 | 6.447: 98 |
| 1.553: 50 | 6.450–476: 96 |
| 1.575: 50 | 6.456–476: 97 |
| 1.594: 50 | 6.469–476: 132 |
| 1.660: 50 | 6.477–493: 96 |
| 1.674: 50 | 6.494–547: 96 |
| 1.677: 50 | 6.700–703: 132 |
| 1.697: 51 | 6.719: 751: 101 |
| 1.717: 51 | 6.756–892: 96 |
| 1.728: 51 | 6.788–808: 131 |
| 1.740: 47 | 6.817–823: 131, 133 |
| 1.740–747: 61 | 6.826–835: 131, 133 |
| 1.742–746: 61 | 6.834: 134 |
| 2.792–794: 132 | 6.847–853: 87, 94–95, 130–131 |
| 3.163–168: 76 | 6.853: 95, 132 |
| 3.441–452: 120 | 6.863–864: 131 |
| 3.444–445: 124 | 6.863–892: 21 |
| 3.452: 122–123 | 6.868: 87 |
| 3.457: 122, 124–125 | 6.868–886: 101 |
| 3.655–661: 59 | 6.875–883: 87, 102–103 |
| 4.229–231: 99–100 | 6.882: 87 |
| 4.345–347: 78 | 6.893–896: 93 |
| 6.14: 118 | 6.893–899: 132 |
| 6.14–33: 22 | 6.893–902: 22 |
| 6.14–37: 115 | 6.894: 104 |
| 6.14–41: 98 | 6.895: 94 |
| 6.20: 116, 118 | 6.896: 104 |
| 6.20–22: 117 | 6.897–899: 104 |
| 6.23: 118 | 7.41: 122, 126 |

Index Locorum

Virgil: *Aeneid* (continued)

7.96–98: 76
7.335–337: 70
7.365–366: 75
7.367–372: 73
7.371–372: 75, 78
8.102–307: 77
8.105: 147n11
8.184–279: 41, 48
8.193–199: 44
8.198–199: 48
8.201–203: 49
8.219: 46
8.228: 46
8.242: 50
8.252–253: 48
8.259: 48
8.260–261: 50
8.266–267: 48
8.362–365: 46
8.384: 46
8.478–496: 83
8.499–503: 77
8.601–622: 77
8.625: 153n22
8.675–728: 20
8.675–730: 69
8.678: 72
8.685: 72
8.691–692: 72
8.691–693: 62
8.696: 51
8.698–700: 72
8.707: 51
8.714–715: 72
8.723: 72

8.722–728: 62
9.601: 78
9.601–613: 74
9.730: 147n10
10.490–500: 86
10.524–525: 84
10.555: 84
10.812: 149n27
10.821–824: 85
10.825–832: 85–86
10.826: 85
10.830–832: 86
10.849–854: 84
11.39–67: 86
11.57–58: 87
11.59–60: 86
11.234–462: 147n11
12.4–8: 147n9
12.4–9: 150n12
12.331–336: 147n9
12.365–367: 147n9
12.718–719: 81
12.825: 147n11
12.827–828: 73
12.830–840: 20
12.930–952: 132

Eclogues

1.1–10: 31
1.19–25: 38
1.27–35: 32–33
1.59–63: 37
1.64–69: 38
1.70–72: 38

Georgics

3.272–275: 144n1

WISCONSIN STUDIES IN CLASSICS

Laura McClure, Mark Stansbury-O'Donnell,
and Matthew Roller

Series Editors

Romans and Barbarians: The Decline of the Western Empire

E. A. Thompson

A History of Education in Antiquity

H. I. Marrou

Translated from the French by George Lamb

Accountability in Athenian Government

Jennifer Tolbert Roberts

Festivals of Attica: An Archaeological Commentary

Erika Simon

Roman Cities: Les villes romaines

Pierre Grimal

Edited and translated by G. Michael Woloch

Ancient Greek Art and Iconography

Edited by Warren G. Moon

Greek Footwear and the Dating of Sculpture

Katherine Dohan Morrow

The Classical Epic Tradition

John Kevin Newman

Ancient Anatolia: Aspects of Change and Cultural Development

Edited by Jeanny Vorys Canby, Edith Porada, Brunilde Sismondo Ridgway, and
Tamara Stech

Euripides and the Tragic Tradition

Ann Norris Michelini

*Wit and the Writing of History: The Rhetoric of Historiography
in Imperial Rome*

Paul Plass

*The Archaeology of the Olympics: The Olympics and Other Festivals
in Antiquity*

Edited by Wendy J. Raschke

Tradition and Innovation in Late Antiquity

Edited by F. M. Clover and R. S. Humphreys

The Hellenistic Aesthetic

Barbara Hughes Fowler

Hellenistic Sculpture I: The Styles of ca. 331–200 B.C.

Brunilde Sismondo Ridgway

Hellenistic Poetry: An Anthology

Selected and translated by Barbara Hughes Fowler

Theocritus' Pastoral Analogies: The Formation of a Genre

Kathryn J. Gutzwiller

Rome and India: The Ancient Sea Trade

Edited by Vimala Begley and Richard Daniel De Puma

Kallimachos: The Alexandrian Library and the Origins of Bibliography

Rudolf Blum

Translated by Hans H. Wellisch

Myth, Ethos, and Actuality: Official Art in Fifth Century B.C. Athens

David Castriota

Archaic Greek Poetry: An Anthology

Selected and translated by Barbara Hughes Fowler

Murlo and the Etruscans: Art and Society in Ancient Etruria
Edited by Richard Daniel De Puma and Jocelyn Penny Small

The Wedding in Ancient Athens
John H. Oakley and Rebecca H. Sinos

The World of Roman Costume
Edited by Judith Lynn Sebesta and Larissa Bonfante

Greek Heroine Cults
Jennifer Larson

Flinders Petrie: A Life in Archaeology
Margaret S. Drower

Polykleitos, the Doryphoros, and Tradition
Edited by Warren G. Moon

The Game of Death in Ancient Rome: Arena Sport and Political Suicide
Paul Plass

Polygnotos and Vase Painting in Classical Athens
Susan B. Matheson

Worshipping Athena: Panathenaia and Parthenon
Edited by Jenifer Neils

*Hellenistic Architectural Sculpture: Figural Motifs in Western Anatolia and
the Aegean Islands*
Pamela A. Webb

Fourth-Century Styles in Greek Sculpture
Brunilde Sismondo Ridgway

Ancient Goddesses: The Myths and the Evidence
Edited by Lucy Goodison and Christine Morris

Displaced Persons: The Literature of Exile from Cicero to Boethius
Jo-Marie Claassen

Hellenistic Sculpture II: The Styles of ca. 200–100 B.C.
Brunilde Sismondo Ridgway

Personal Styles in Early Cycladic Sculpture

Pat Getz-Gentle

The Complete Poetry of Catullus

Catullus

Translated and with commentary by David Mulroy

Hellenistic Sculpture III: The Styles of ca. 100–31 B.C.

Brunilde Sismondo Ridgway

*The Iconography of Sculptured Statue Bases in the Archaic and
Classical Periods*

Angeliki Kosmopoulou

Discs of Splendor: The Relief Mirrors of the Etruscans

Alexandra A. Carpino

Mail and Female: Epistolary Narrative and Desire in Ovid's "Heroides"

Sara H. Lindheim

Modes of Viewing in Hellenistic Poetry and Art

Graham Zanker

Religion in Ancient Etruria

Jean-René Jannot

Translated by Jane K. Whitehead

A Symposion of Praise: Horace Returns to Lyric in "Odes" IV

Timothy Johnson

Satire and the Threat of Speech: Horace's "Satires," Book 1

Catherine M. Schlegel

Prostitutes and Courtesans in the Ancient World

Edited by Christopher A. Faraone and Laura K. McClure

Asinaria: The One about the Asses

Plautus

Translated and with commentary by John Henderson

Ulysses in Black: Ralph Ellison, Classicism, and African American Literature

Patrice D. Rankine

Imperium and Cosmos: Augustus and the Northern Campus Martius

Paul Rehak

Edited by John G. Younger

Ovid before Exile: Art and Punishment in the "Metamorphoses"

Patricia J. Johnson

Pandora's Senses: The Feminine Character of the Ancient Text

Vered Lev Kenaan

Nox Philologiae: Aulus Gellius and the Fantasy of the Roman Library

Erik Gunderson

New Perspectives on Etruria and Early Rome

Edited by Sinclair Bell and Helen Nagy

The Image of the Poet in Ovid's "Metamorphoses"

Barbara Pavlock

Responses to Oliver Stone's "Alexander": Film, History, and Cultural Studies

Edited by Paul Cartledge and Fiona Rose Greenland

*The Codrus Painter: Iconography and Reception of Athenian Vases
in the Age of Pericles*

Amalia Avramidou

The Matter of the Page: Essays in Search of Ancient and Medieval Authors

Shane Butler

Greek Prostitutes in the Ancient Mediterranean, 800 BCE–200 CE

Edited by Allison Glazebrook and Madeleine M. Henry

Sophocles' "Philoctetes" and the Great Soul Robbery

Norman Austin

Oedipus Rex

Sophocles

A verse translation by David Mulroy, with introduction and notes

The Slave in Greece and Rome

John Andreau and Raymond Descat

Translated by Marion Leopold

Perfidy and Passion: Reintroducing the "Iliad"

Mark Buchan

*The Gift of Correspondence in Classical Rome: Friendship in Cicero's
"Ad Familiares" and Seneca's "Moral Epistles"*

Amanda Wilcox

Antigone

Sophocles

A verse translation by David Mulroy, with introduction and notes

Aeschylus's "Suppliant Women": The Tragedy of Immigration

Geoffrey W. Bakewell

Couched in Death: "Klinai" and Identity in Anatolia and Beyond

Elizabeth P. Baughan

Silence in Catullus

Benjamin Eldon Stevens

Odes

Horace

Translated with commentary by David R. Slavitt

Shaping Ceremony: Monumental Steps and Greek Architecture

Mary B. Hollinshead

Selected Epigrams

Martial

Translated with notes by Susan McLean

The Offense of Love: "Ars Amatoria," "Remedia Amoris," and "Tristia" 2

Ovid

A verse translation by Julia Dyson Hejduk, with introduction and notes

Oedipus at Colonus

Sophocles

A verse translation by David Mulroy, with introduction and notes

Women in Roman Republican Drama

Edited by Dorota Dutsch, Sharon L. James, and David Konstan

Dream, Fantasy, and Visual Art in Roman Elegy

Emma Sciolì

Agamemnon

Aeschylus

A verse translation by David Mulroy, with introduction and notes

*Trojan Women, Helen, Hecuba: Three Plays about Women
and the Trojan War*

Euripides

Verse translations by Francis Blessington, with introductions and notes

Echoing Hylas: A Study in Hellenistic and Roman Metapoetics

Mark Heerink

Horace between Freedom and Slavery: The First Book of "Epistles"

Stephanie McCarter

The Play of Allusion in the "Historia Augusta"

David Rohrbacher

Repeat Performances: Ovidian Repetition and the "Metamorphoses"

Edited by Laurel Fulkerson and Tim Stover

Virgil and Joyce: Nationalism and Imperialism in the "Aeneid" and "Ulysses"

Randall J. Pogorzelski

The Athenian Adonia in Context: The Adonis Festival as Cultural Practice

Laurialan Reitzammer